A HISTORY OF *The* SAṀSKṚTA LITERATURE

5257

V. Varadachari

709
L

A HISTORY OF
THE SAṀSKṚTA LITERATURE

A

HISTORY

OF

THE SAṀSKṚTA LITERATURE

By

DR. V. VARADACHARI, M.A., PH. D.
Dip. in French & German
Department of Sanskrit
Sri Venkateswara University College
Tirupati

Revised & Enlarged Edition

Ram Narain Lal Beni Prasad
(*Successors to* Ram Narain Lal Publisher)
PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS
ALLAHABAD-2
1960

2nd Edition] [Price Rs. 5

891.209
V42h

2M1060

5257

PREFACE

In the following pages, an attempt is made to present a revised and improved version of the first edition of the History of the *Saṁskṛta* Literature. In this version are omitted the narration of the contents of the important works included in the previous one, as most of them are familiar to the readers. Some noteworthy quotations from the works of a few prominent writers are included here so as to make the beginners interested in *Saṁskṛta* get acquainted with the nature of the literature in general. The questions regarding the date of Kālidāsa, authorship of the Trivandrum plays and Daṇḍin's authorship of the *Avantisundarī*, *Daśakumāracarita* and *Kāvyādarśa* are discussed in greater detail. Religion of the *Vedas*, astronomical evidence for fixing the date of the *Mahābhārata* and *Vīraśaiva* system of *Saivism* are the new topics included for treatment in this edition. In general, this edition contains information on authors and their works not noticed in the previous edition. As far as it has been possible sources for the statements are given in the footnote. I wish to mention here with gratitude that, in the preparation of this edition, I have made use of the valuable information contained in the various research journals. It is hoped that the matter and the mode of treatment would meet the demand of the readers.

V. Varadachari.

CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

Preface

Contents

Page.

I. *Introductory*

Saṁskṛta—Vedic and classical periods—spoken and literary language—Prākṛta and its varieties—writing in ancient India—peculiar features of the Indian literature—contribution of the Western critics to the study of the Indian literature 1

II. *Vedas*

Classification of the Vedic texts—system of their study .. 9

III. *Vedas as interpreted by the Orientalists*

Similar features in the Vedas and in the Zend Avesta—home of the Vedas—composition of the Vedas—interpretation—Vedic civilisation 11

IV. *A criticism of the Orientalists' view about the Vedas.*

Conclusion that could be drawn from the similar features exhibited by the Vedas and Zend Avesta—home of the Vedas—periods of their composition—connotation of Veda according to Indian tradition—authorship—traditional commentators reliable exponents—religion of the Vedas 17

V. *Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka portions of the Vedas*

The recensions of the four Vedas 23

VI. *Upaniṣad*

The main and minor texts—their classification. 27

VII. *Vedāṅgas*

The six supplements—Śikṣā, Vyākarana, Chandas, Nirukta, Jyotiṣa and Kalpa—texts of the various recensions—Vedic indexes .. 30

VIII. *Epics—Rāmāyana*

Features of the epic-literature—authorship of the Rāmāyaṇa—date—popularity—commentaries 35

IX. *Mahābhārata.*

Three stages in the development of the epic—Jaya—Bhārata—Mahābhārata—date—critical estimate—as a Dharmaśāstra—Harivaṁśa—Upākhyānas—commentaries—Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata as the national epics of India 47

X. *Purāṇas*

Definition—authorship—date—importance—classification—brief account of the Purāṇas—Upapurāṇas 60

XI. *Pre-Kālidāsa Kāvya period*

What is a Kāvya—characterestic features of the Mahākāvya—Vālmīki, Pāṇini, Vararuci and Piṅgala 67

XII. *Kālidāsa*

Date of Kālidāsa—Raghuvaṁśa and Kumārasambhava .. 69

CHAPTERS Page

XIII. *Post-Kālidāsa Kāvyas*

Aśvaghoṣa—Renaissance theory—inscriptions—Kāmasūtra—Pravarasena—Kumāradāsa—Bhāravi—Māgha—Śrīharṣa and others—features of the Kāvya during this period 76

XIV. *Lyrics*

Features of the lyric—erotic type—Meghasandeśa— Amaruśataka—Gītagovinda and others—devotional type—general features—Śaṅkara—Rāmānuja—Vedāntadeśika—Nārāyanabhaṭṭa—Jagannātha paṇḍita—Nīlakaṇṭhadikṣita and others 92

XV. *Gnomic and Didactic Poetry*

General features—origin and development—Bhartṛhari—Dāmodaragupta—Kṣemendra—Jagannāthapaṇḍita—Nīlakaṇṭhadikṣita—Anyāpadeśa—Bhallaṭa and others 99

XVI. *Anthology*

Features—Gāthāsaptaśatī—Āryāsaptaśatī—Saduktikarṇāmṛta and others 103

XVII. *Prose*

Definition and general features—Kathā and Ākhyāyikā—origin—Bāṇa—authorship of the Avantisundarī and Daśakumāracarita—Subandhu, Dhanapāla and others 105

XVIII. *Campu*

Definition and features—origin—Nalacapmu—Yaśastilaka—Rāmāyaṇacampu and others 114

XIX. *Popular Tale*

General features—Bṛhatkathā—language, form, contents and date—abridgements—Buddhist tales—stories of Vikramāditya and others 118

XX. *Didactic fable*

General features—Pañcatantra and Hitopadeśa 123

XXI. *Saṁskṛta drama, origin, characterestics and types*

Traditional view about the origin—early beginnings—Greek origin discussed—definition and characterestic features—types of Rūpaka and Uparūpakas 127

XXII. *Bhāsa and Kālidāsa*

Trivandrum plays—their authorship—plays of Bhāsa—dramas of Kālidāsa—Kālidāsa as a writer 137

XXIII. *Post-Kālidāsan Dramatists*

Sūdraka—Diṅnāga—Viśākhadatta—Harṣavardhana—Bhaṭṭanarāyaṇa Bhavabhūti—Murāri—Rājaśekhara and others—allegorical plays—Chāyānāṭaka—decline 148

XXIV. *History*

Paucity of works on history discussed—Harṣacarita—Rājatarngiṇī and others 166

XXV. *Theories of Poetry and Drama*

Sāhitya, Alaṁkāra—theories-main and subsidiary-Bharata—Daṇḍin—Bhāmāha—Vāmana—Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta—Rājaśekhara—Dhañañjaya—Bhoja—Kṣemendra—Mammaṭa—

CHAPTERS Page.

Ruyyaka—Appayadıkṣita—Jagannāthapaṇḍita and others—aims of writing poetry 170

XXVI. *Scientific literature*

Characterestic Features and Grammar

Definition of śāstra—General features of works on śāstra subjects —āstika and nāstika—Grammar—Pāṇini—Vararuci—Patañjali —Bhartṛhari—Bhaṭṭojidıkṣita—Nāgeśa and others—Sphoṭa theory —Schools of grammar other than Pāṇini's—Prākṛta grammar .. 183

XXVII. *Prosody and Lexicography*

Prosody—vṛtta and jāti—lexicons—on homonyms and synonyms .. 192

XXVIII. *Jyautiṣa*

General features—early treatises—five siddhāntas—astronomy—astrology and mathematics—Varāhamihira-palmistry—Āryabhaṭa —Brahmagupta—Bhāskarācārya and others—Greek origin discussed 195

XXIX. *Dharmaśāstra*

Definition of dharma—sources—classifications—law texts—digests on law— 201

XXX. *Upavedas—Āyurveda, Gāndharveda, Dhanurveda, Arthaśāstra and Ancillary sciences*

Scope of the upavedas—Āyurveda—General principlesinature of treatment—Caraka—Suśruta—Vāgbhaṭā rasavada diseases of animals —Greek origin—Kāmaśāstra—scope—texts- Gāndharvaveda—dancing and music—texts—Dhanurveda—Arthaśāstra—scope Arthaśāstra and others—Ancillary Sciences—architecture—painting —Ratnaśāstra—Stealing—Aeronautics—Botany—Chemistry—decline of the applied sciences. 204

XXXI. *Philoso;hy and Religion—General Principles*

Explanation and scope of philosophy and religion—sources—classification 216

XXXII. *Nāstika systems*

Cārvaka—Buddhism—General principles—the four schools—Hınayāna and Mahāyāna—early texts on religion and logic—theistic Buddhism—Nāgārjuna—Diṅnāga—Dharamkırti and others—Jainism—General principles—Syādvāda—two sects— —early Āgamas—Umāsvāti—Akalaṅka—Hemacandra and others —biographical accounts 219

XXXIII. *Āstika Systems—Nyāya, Vaiśesika, Sāṅkhya and Yoga*

Sūtra period—Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika—special features—important texts—Sāṅkhya—general features—texts—Yoga—aim and scope—texts—Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga 226

XXXIV. *Āstika Systems—Mımāṁsā*

Scope—Bhāṭṭa—Prābhākara—Murāri—texts—Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa .. 233

XXXV. *Āstika and Religious Systems—Vedānta*

Aim and Scope—Sources—basic texts—Dvaita—Advaita—Viśiṣṭādvaita—Śuddhādvaita—Bhedābheda—Bhāskara—Yādavaprakāśa —Nimbārka—Caitanya—Śivādvaita—Śaivism—Śaiva—Pāśupata —Vıraśāiva—Kashmir Śaivism—Spanda and Pratyabhijña schools Śāktaism—History of Philosophy 237

XXXVI. *Conclusion*

Importance of Saṁskṛta—cultural importance—need for a restudy of Indian history 253

Appendix .. .. i—v

Index .. ..

ERRATA

Page	line	Incorrect	Correct
31	41	व्युत्षत्तः	व्युत्पत्तेः
35	5	*itiāhsa*	itihāsa
36	28	ablition	ablution
37	37	*kaślo*	*śloka*
40	11	चतुर्विंशत्	चतुर्विंशति
44	16	hemitages	hermitages
48	21	तथापरिचरा	तथोपरिचरा
50	31	vāparayuga	Dvāparayuga
58	15	धमादथंश्च	धर्मादियंश्च
60	27	read could find room after on all aspects of life	
86	4	नषधं	नैषधं
87	37	prblific	prolific
88	33	read Rasikaranjana after composed	
92	23	froms	forms
101	14	नरकल्केश	नरकक्लेश
109	37	Daḍin	Daṇḍin
	44	attached	attacked
125	5	orm	form
	22	before	after
127	*title*	chaacterestics	characterestics
143	12	शारीरव	शरीरैरिव
158	38	Kuvalyayamālā	Kuvalayamālā
160	18	read Jayasimhasuri after Jain	
163	18	दश्यते	दृश्यते
174	7	Medhavivirudra	Medhavirudra
177	14	Alankārasañgraha	Alaṅkāra-sārasaṅgraha

Page	line	Incorrect	Correct
180	38	Alankārasārasaṅgraha	Alankāra-sangraha
187	28	स्फुटत्यथो	स्फुटत्यर्थो
193	15	deals	deal
194	9	he	the
209	39	read is after which	
216	12	religion	re+igion
217	24	ater	later
220	46	serons	sermons
221	19	There	They
222	5	Śūryasaptati	Śūnyasaptati
238	14	read which was also the name of his work after Kṛtakoṭi	
239	5	signicance	significance
244	13	laer	later
254	10	independent to	dependent on

A
HISTORY
OF
THE SAṀSKṚTA LITERATURE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Saṁskṛta is the name given to the language which has been in use in India for religious and secular purposes since the very earliest times. This name was acquired by this language after 700 B.C. when Pāṇini the grammarian framed the rules of grammar for this language. Before this period, it was called the divine speech दैवी वाक्. The word *saṁskṛta*, as applied to this language, shows that this language became perfected, refined and polished. It is in this language that the ancient literature of the Indians is found recorded. It is only in the later periods that the languages derived from the *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta* languages came to be employed for literary purposes. Even during this period, the *Saṁskṛta* language dominated the literary field.

Two main stages are found to mark the growth of this language. They are :—1. Vedic period and 2. classical period. During the first period, the language was simple, natural and forcible. The *Vedas* and the texts allied to them represent the literature during this period. The Vedic *Saṁskṛta* displays varieties of grammatical forms. The *parasmaipada* and *ātmanepada* terminations are found used freely and were interchangeable. The infinitives had different endings, such as से, तवे and तवै yielding forms वचे, सूतवे and मादयितवै respectively. The indeclinable participles had forms ending in त्वाय as in गत्वाय. देवासः, विप्रासः, कर्णेभिः, पूर्वेभिः, and देवेभिः are some of the instances representing the peculiar forms of nouns in declension. Equally peculiar are the forms of the infinitive like परादै, भूवे, समिधम् and संदृशि. and the gerunds like कर्त्वी, ववत्वा. All these forms disappeared in the classical *Saṁskṛta* period.

During the Vedic period, this language was used for both religious and conversational purposes. The priests, who made a correct use of it while performing the sacred rites, committed mistakes while using it for conversation. Attempts were made by many grammarians at various stages to frame the rules with a view to prevent this abuse of the language. It was not till the 7th century B.C. that this purpose was achieved by *Pāṇini* who wrote his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* laying down definite rules for this language. He was followed in this attempt by Kātyāyana also known as Vararuci who wrote in the 5th century B.C.,his *Vārtika* on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and by Patañjali who wrote in the 2nd century B.C. his *Mahābhāṣya* on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī.* The rules and interpretations thereon by Kātyāyana and Patañjali perfected the language giving it the name *Saṁskṛta.*

Pāṇini framed the rules of grammar applicable to the Vedic language as used for the performance of the sacred rites and also to the language used during the same period for secular purposes. Pāṇini gave the appellation '*bhāṣā*' for the latter. This '*bhāṣā*', which differed from the Vedic language in certain respects, shall be taken to have represented the beginnings of the classical language during the Vedic period.

During the classical period, the *Saṁskṛta* language had a rich development. Topics of interest of religious and secular nature were discussed employing this language. Poetry, arts and dialectics found in this language an agreeable mode of expression. In fact, there is no subject of study which did not receive treatment through this language.

In the course of the development of this language during this period, certain characteristic features began to mark this language notwithstanding the rules of Pāṇini and other grammarians. The *bhāṣā*, which was a spoken language during the days of Pāṇini ceased to grow owing to the influence of the rules of Pāṇini. The result was the disappearance of dialectal variations. Participles came to be used in lieu of the finite verbs. Sentences were framed without finite verbs. For the sake of brevity, compounds of inordinate length took the place of subordinate clauses. The restrictions, enforced by Pāṇini regarding the use of tenses conveying the past sense, came to be ignored. The pitch accent recognised by Pāṇini gave room for the stress accent. The verbal forms in the tenses have completely disappeared in the scientific treatises written after the 15th century A.D.

Along with the *Saṁskṛta* language, there has been growing a different language called *Prākṛta.* It was the language of the people. It is known as *Prākṛta*, as it was related to people (प्रकृति). प्रकृतौ भवं प्राकृतम्। This language was used by the people who understood the *Saṁskṛta* language but were unable to use it. Though it had an independent existence, it was closely allied to the *Saṁskṛta* language and was greatly influenced by it[1]. The special feature of this language is that it had no *ātmanepada* termination for verbal forms.

That *Saṁskṛta* under the name *bhāṣā* was used for conversational purposes is borne out by some evidences. Pāṇini framed the rules for the Vedic language and for the *bhāṣā*. Patañjali tells that the purpose of grammar is not to create words but to make clear what correct uses are. This statement presupposes the existence of a spoken language. He tells further that there were sages using incorrect expressions while conversing with each other but using the correct ones while performing the sacred rites. Thus he writes[1]—

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa* I. 33

एवं हि श्रूयते—यर्वाणस्तर्वाणो नाम ऋषयो बभूवुः प्रत्यक्षधर्माणः परापरज्ञा विदितवेदितव्या अधिगतयाथातथ्याः । ते तत्रभवन्तो यद्वा नस्तद्वा न इति प्रयोक्तव्ये यर्वाणस्तर्वाण इति प्रयुञ्जते । याज्ञे पुनः कर्मणि नापभाषन्ते ।

Besides this, he gives an anecdote involving a grammarian and a charioteer on the etymology of the word '*sūta*' and shows how, while a grammarian was not sure of the correctness of an expression, even laymen like the charioteer were aware of it.[2] Some words like ऊष, तेर, चक्र, and पेच are found used to convey peculiar senses.[3] People mispronounced certain words, e.g., *ṣaṣa* for *śaśa*; *palāṣa* for *palāśa* ; *mañjaka* or *mañcaka* etc.[4]. Certain expressions conveyed different senses in different parts of the country.

Vide :—शवतिर्गतिकर्मा कम्बोजेष्वेव भाषितो भवति; विकार एनमार्या भाषन्ते शव इति । हम्मतिः सुराष्ट्रेषु, रंहतिः प्राच्यमध्येषु, गमिमेव त्वार्याः प्रयुञ्जते । दातिर्लवनार्थे प्राच्येषु दात्रमुदीच्येषु ।

Mahābhāṣya 1.1.1

Pāṇini speaks of certain suffixes as acceptable to the people in particular parts of the country.[5].

Vide :—प्रियतद्धिता दाक्षिणात्याः ।

Mahābhāṣya 1.1.1

He draws the distinction in sense between पुत्रादिनी and पुत्त्रादिनी.[6] While persons are to be called from a distance, the final vowels in the vocative case forms are to be elongated[7]. Detailed information is given about the terms used in the game of dice[8], speech of herdsmen[9] and about the use of accent. The instances cited above would become meaningless unless they are to be interpreted as having been used by people for the purpose of conversing with each other. The rules regarding the use of भवत् in the place of युष्मत्[10], of the nonelision of the genitive case while conveying contempt,[11] of the formation of onomatopoeic

---

1. *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 1
2. *Mahābhāṣya* 2. 4. 56
3. ,, 1. 1. 1
4. ,, 1. 1. 1
5. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4-1-17 ; 7-3-46 ; 4-1-43
6. *Aṣṭadhyayī* 8-4-48
7. ,, 8-2-84
8. ,, 3-3-70
9. ,, 4-2-39 ; 7-1-1 : 4-2-47
10. ,, 1. 4. 108
11. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6-3-21 ; *cf.* 1-4-106

words[1], of words of अन्वादेश import[2] and of governance of particular case suffixes[3] lend support to the status of the *Saṁskṛta* language having been a spoken one . The restriction in the dramas regarding the use of *Saṁskṛta* and dialects of the *Prākṛta* languages must have been based on the activities of poeple.

During the classical period, the *Saṁskṛta* language was employed for literary purposes. Works in every branch of study were written in *Saṁskṛta*. In the courts of kings, *Saṁskṛta* became the official language. Inscriptions, private official documents, edicts, grants and panegyrics were composed mostly in *Saṁskṛta* from early times down to the 19th century A.D. The Buddhists and the Jains, who preferred the use of *Prākṛta* to that of *Saṁskṛta*, found *Saṁskṛta* to be a better vehicle for literary purposes than *Prākṛta*. Aśvaghoṣa, the Buddhist philosopher of the 1st century A.D. wrote his works in *Saṁskṛta*. Siddharṣi, the Jain writer, speaks of the advantages of *Saṁskṛta* over *Prākṛta* in the lines :—

संस्कृता प्राकृता चेति भाषे प्राधान्यमर्हतः ।
तत्रापि संस्कृता तावद् विदग्धहृदि स्थिता ।।
वालानामपि सद्वोधकारिणी कर्णपेशला ।
तथापि प्राकृता भाषा न तेषामपि भासते ।।

Upamitibhāvaprapañcakathā. I 51, 52.

The physician Caraka refers to the use of *Saṁskṛta* by the men of his profession in their discussions. Hieun-Thsang, the Chinese pilgrim of the 7th Century A.D. records the use of *Saṁskṛta* by the Buddhists of India. Bilhaṇa, the poet of Kashmir, tells that the women of Kashmir understood *Saṁskṛta* poems[4].

The works of the grammarians prevented the abuse of language but made the language static. The result was that the gulf, which existed between *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta* before it was effectively controlled by Pāṇini and his followers, began to grow wider from day to day. After a time, it became all the more widened, as the *Saṁskṛta* poets, under the influence of the grammarians, began to play on words and to use recondite expressions thus making the language more and more artificial. As *Prākṛta* grew up, *Saṁskṛta* became less popular as a medium of expression and began to lose hold on society. This decadence of *Saṁskṛta* was noticed by those given to literary pursuits. Steps were taken by them to make *Saṁskṛta* regain its status. The writing of the *Hitopadeśa* and *Pañcatantra* shows the result of such attempts. The handbooks on rituals, called '*prayoga*' were also written in *Saṁskṛta* with the same object in view. These efforts,

---

1. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1-3-90
2. *Aśṭadhyayī* 2-4-32 ; 2-4-34
3. „ 2-3-16 ; 2-3-17
4. *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* XVIII 6

however, have not yielded appreciable results but have slowed down the pace of decadence.

At present, *Saṁskṛta* is spoken of as a dead language. It must be understood that it was never a living language in the sense of a language spoken by the entire population of India or in a particular region. It was spoken by the cultured class. A language is said to be dead when it ceases to exert organic influence on the people and on the languages of the land. When viewed in this sense, *Saṁskṛta* is not dead. It continues to live in the land by enriching the various languages of India and serves as the only link for bringing together the various languages thus proving the unity of the people of India. In addition to this, it continues, as in former days, to be used for both secular and religious purposes.

Prākṛta, which was the spoken language of the people, became the literary language and continued to be the spoken language in the centuries which preceded the Christian era. In the 6th century B.C., Gautama and Mahāvīra preached their doctrines in *Prākṛta*. In the period of Aśoka, it became the state language. During this period, the inscriptions were written in this language. By the beginning of the Christian era, its adherents had to adopt *Saṁskṛta* for their discussions and debates with their rivals. After this period, *Saṁskṛta* became the literary language even for the Buddhists and Jains, although *Prākṛta* was not entirely given up particularly by the Jains.

As a spoken language, *Prākṛta* had many dialects. The well-known among them are :—1. *Māgadhī* in which Gautama preached his doctrines, 2. *Ardhamāgadhī* in the old form of which Mahāvlra preached his doctrines and 3. *Ṣaurasenī*. The regions where these flourished were respectively 1 Eastern lands now identified with Bihar, 2. Vārāṇasī and the neighbouring regions and 3. the regions of Mathurā on the banks of Yamunā. *Mahārāṣṭrī* and *Bengāli* have sprung from *Māgadhī*. From *Śaurasenī* arose Eastern *Panjabi*, *Hindi* and *Gujarati*.

About 400 A.D. there came into being a dialect of *Prākṛta* under the name *Apabhraṁśa*. It occupied a position midway between the literary *Prākṛta* and modern Indian languages. It had a limited vocabulary. It was mainly responsible for the rise of modern languages partly by influencing the dialects which already existed and partly by bringing new dialects into being. Bihari, Oriya and other languages appear to have taken their rise as a result of the influence of *Apabhraṁśa*.

In the early periods, writing was not put to practise. Instructions were given orally by the preceptors to their disciples. This is shown by the words like '*śruti*' meaning the *Vedas*, '*smṛti*' referring to the law books, and '*śūkta*', '*anuvāka*' and others used to denote the divisions of passages and texts. This is supported by the terms '*anusvāra*', '*visarga*', '*jihvāmūlīya*', '*upadhmānīya*' and others referring to the varieties of sounds. The works on grammar and the epics contain references to writing. The word '*lipi*' is used in the sense of a script. The root '*likh*' is found used in the sense of placing the the syllables (*akṣaravinyāsa*), or of scratching on stone or leaf.[1] These references together with the inscriptions of Aśoka, prove that writing was known and was put to practise about 300 B.C. It seems that writing was not practised generally owing to the nonavailability of materials which could withstand the test of time.

The inscriptions during the period of Aśoka show that the art of writing was considerably developed in the 2nd century B.C. The method of writing was from left to right, although a coin is found to have the writing from right to left. The barks of trees and palm-leaves were used for writing purposes. A stilus was used to scratch the forms of letters on them. The word '*maśī*' in the sense of ink was used in the 2nd century B.C. The leaves and tree barks, which were used for writing, were arranged and held together by a cord passed through the holes provided in them at fixed places. Hence the works written in them came to be called '*grantha*'. Paper came to be used in the place of these materials after the advent of the Muslims in the 11th century A.D. The oldest palm-leaf manuscript which is available is dated in the 8th century A.D. and the oldest paper manuscript is dated 1223 A.D. Even after the introduction of paper, tree bark and palm-leaves continued to be used in South India.

The *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta* literatures exhibit cetrtain peculiar features. Firstly, there is no line of distinction drawn between the works of artistic production and those of didactic nature. The works, which are purely works of art, contain statements of didactic nature and those of didactic import are given an artistic colouring. Secondly, no restriction is found enforced in the use of a particular form of composition. A subject which is taken up for treatment is dealt with by using the verse or prose form, e.g., grammar, lexicograpny, medicine, astronomy, philosophy and others. Thirdly, the tendency of the Indian writer was to analyse and subject the topic treated to a careful scrutiny. This tendency, which originally belonged to the writers on scientific subjects, influenced writers on grammar, rhetorics, politics, music, dramaturgy and others. Fourthly, the scholars were inclined to explain and comment on the works of their predecessors. This has been responsible for the writing of commentaries on the standard texts. Lastly, every work betrays the influence of religion.

A critical and thorough study of the *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta* literatures is beset with serious handicaps. Paucity of information about the writers and their works and complete reticense of the poets about themselves forbid us from drawing any clue or reference about the the writers and their works. Names like Vālmīki, Kālidāsa, Daṇḍin and others appear as titles of the writers and do not help us in knowing their names. In some cases of writers like Bhaṭṭāraharicandra,

---

[1] The works of Kālidāsa contain references to the way of writing in this sense. *Abhijñanaśākuntala* Act III *Raghuvaṁśa* III 28 and *Kumārasambhava* I 7

Meṇṭha and others, their names alone have come down to us, their works having been lost. The names of writers of some works like *Puṣpabāṇavilāsa*, *Śṛṅgāratilaka* are lost, while works of this kind are attributed to the authorship of well-known writers like Kālidāsa. The motive behind such attributions can be easily guessed. The prevailing atmosphere in the literary circles must have favoured the continuance to posterity of works which were adjudged best and those which came next to them. The writers who could not maintain the standard of poets of repute should have feared indifferent or unfavourable treatment to their works in those circles. To prevent the utter loss to posterity of their productions they should have allowed their works to pass under the authorship of well-known writers. This has given rise to doubts regarding the works attributed to writers of repute, nay, has even led the well-known works of those writers to the stage of being doubted regarding their authorship. This applies also to many general statements found now quoted as from more than one well-known writer.

Added to this handicap is the loss of valuable works. The Greeks and the Arabians, who had contacts with India, took away with them some rare works of India. They are not available any where at present. In their attempt to save themselves from the Hindu critics, the Buddhists took away with them many rare works which they, having reached Tibet and China, rendered into *Tibetan* and *Chinese*. The forerign missionaries British and German had taken away with them some rare works. If some of these are made available, or if at least any idea is to be had about them, then it would throw much light on the literary history of India.

Fortunately, there are certain land marks now available for the proper understanding of Indian literature. They are the death of Gautama the founder of Buddhism in 485 B.C. and Alexander's invasion in 326 B.C. The records of Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador in the court of Candragupta, the inscriptions of Aśoka who ruled from 269 B.C. to 232 B.C., those of the Chinese pilgrims Fahien, Hieun-thsang and I-tsing who visited India in the periods 399-414, 629-645 and 672-675 A.D. respectively and those of Alberuni who visited India about 1030 A.D. are very helpful in understanding the religious and political situations during those periods. Besides these, the coins, inscriptions on pillars and copper-plate grants belonging to the periods of kings of various dynasties throw light on the events of historical importance. The nature and style of a composition also help in determining its age. The anthologies and the works on rhetorics give useful information in determining the chronology of the Indian literature.

The historical study of the *Saṁskṛta* language and its literature was begun by the travellers and the missionaries who came to India from Europe from the 16th century A.D. The discovery of *Saṁskṛta* and the close affinity, which it displays to the languages of Europe like Greek and *Latin*, made them take a keen interest in the study of

Saṁskṛta. The study of comparative philology was begun as a result of the efforts of Schlegel, a German scholar who wrote in 1808, a work on the Language and Wisdom of the Indians. These scholars of the West took a keen interest in the study of the *Vedas* and sciences (*śāstras*). Sir William Jones, and H.T. Colebrooke among the British, and Buhler, Keilhorn, Francis Bopp, Grimm, Grassmann, Jesperson, Wackernagel, Ṛoth, Maxmuller, Weber and others among the Germans, were the writers who made valuable contributions for enriching the Indian literature. They also brought out good editions of the Indian works together with translations in the European languages. Bhartṛhari's poem was rendered into into *Dutch* by Abraham Roger in 1651 and Kālidāsa's *Śākuntalam* was rendered into *English* in 1789 by Sir William Jones which won the appreciation and admiration of Herder and Goethe, the German poets. The *Manusmṛti* was published in 1794 and the *Bhagavadgītā* in 1785 by Charles Wilkins. The Vedic texts were published by Max-Muller and the *Ṛgveda* was rendered into *English* by the same author.

The efforts of the host of the Western scholars who made a beginning for a critical study of the *Saṁskṛta* literature and of the Indian scholars who following the lead of the Western scholars devoted themselves earnestly to the proper understanding of the Indian literature have borne fruit in many directions. It is these Western scholars that opened the door leading to scientific research. Still, the results arrived at by them have to be admitted with reservations. Bent on discovering historical facts through research, these scholars did not take into consideration the circumstances which could have prompted the Indian writers for writing their works and without which an impartial estimate of a literary product could not be had. The religious spirit pervading the *Saṁskṛta* literature and the spirit of toleration characterising it have been treated by them as factors spoiling the artistic effect and the real value of this literature. These scholars formulated certain theories which are very often opposed to the actual state of affairs. Especially regarding the authorship of certain texts, the extent of the original text and the dates of the poets, their conclusions are one sided and detrimental to the greatness of the Indian nation. Besides, these conclusions are not final.

A study of the *Saṁskṛta* literature is therefore to be based on the lines adopted by the Western scholars, avoiding at the same time the defects which have crept into the observation of these scholars. The limitations, which loom large before a keen student of the Indian literature due to the lack of authentic information about historical facts, should be borne in mind and in the light of these limitations, conclusions have to be drawn. It is then alone that a proper appreciation of the *Saṁskṛta* literature would become possible.

CHAPTER II

VEDAS

The Vedic literature consists of the *Vedas* and the works allied to them. The word '*veda*,' is derived from the root '*vid*' which means to know. Therefore, *Veda* is that which serves as the means to get knowledge. Indians hold the *Vedas* as the sacred sources of knowledge.

The *Vedas* are four in number viz. *Ṛgveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda* and *Atharvaveda*. The *Ṛgveda* comprises hymns called *ṛks* which are metrical in form. These hymns are composed in stanzas of four lines, sometimes of three and two also. *Gāyatrī*, *Anuṣṭubh*, *Bṛhatī*, *Paṅkti*, *Triṣṭubh*, *Jagatī* and others are the well-known metres in which these hymns are found composed. These hymns are in the form of praise of the deities. Some among them are related to the performance of the sacrifices and some are of philosophical import. The major portions of the *Yajurveda* are written in prose. The word '*yajus*' means worship. The function and purpose of this *Veda* is to explain and expound the significance of the performance of the sacred rites. This *Veda* contains many of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* incorporated. They are required to be sung while performing the sacrifices. *Suklayajurveda* and *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* are the two branches of this *Veda*. The *Sāmaveda* can be called the *Veda* of songs. The word '*sāman*' means music or singing. The major portion of this *Veda* comprises the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* which are required to be sung. The modes of singing them are two viz., *ūhagāna* and *ūhyagāna* respectively. The *Atharvaveda* deals with charms and chants to be used for offensive and defensive purposes. It contains songs and spells to get long life, for expiation and for the restoration of harmony in family life. The hymns in this *Veda* contain directions for keeping away the evil spirits and for cursing the demons. This *Veda* too contains the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. Hymns of philosophical nature are not absent in it. This *Veda* does not directly contribute to the performance of the sacred rites which form the main subject of treatment of the other three *Vedas*. Hence for a long time, this *Veda* was not grouped with the other three. The *Puruṣasūkta* portion of the *Ṛgveda* refers only to the three *Vedas*.[1] The term '*trayī*' used to refer to the three *Vedas* points to this but at no stage was it considered as holding a position inferior to the other three *Vedas*. In the later period, it came to be grouped along with the other three *Vedas*.[2]

---

1. *Ṛgveda* X—90-9 *Cf.* *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* 5-32
2. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1. 1. 5 ; *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* 2-16

The text of each *Veda* is of four parts viz., *Saṁhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Āraṇyaka* and *Upaniṣad*. The *Saṁhitā* portion refers to the passages which are hymns of praise and which are required to be recited or sung during the performance of the sacred rites. The *Brāhmaṇa* portion refers to the passages which are explanatory of the ritualistic aspect of the hymns. The *Āraṇyaka* portion refers to the passages which are concerned with the rites to be performed by a man when he leads a life of retirement in the forest. The Upaniṣadic portion represents the final stage containing the philosophical doctrines.

The *Saṁhitā* portions of the *Vedas*, the *Brāhmaṇa* portion of the *Śuklayajurveda* and the *Brāhmaṇa*, *Āraṇyaka* and Upaniṣadic portions of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* are accented. In these texts, the accent is musical depending upon the pitch. There are three accents called by the names *Udātta*, *Anudātta* and *Svarita*. *Udātta* means raised, *Anudātta* low and *Svarita* sounded and these correspond to acute, grave and circumflex accents respectively. In the *Ṛgveda*, the *udātta* is not marked, the *Anudātta* is marked by a horizontal stroke below the syllable and the *Svarita* by a vertical stroke above the syllable.

The Vedic texts have been ordinarily recited and handed down orally from preceptor to pupil. Much care was enforced on the student to get the texts by heart without a single error in pronunciation and accent. The *Vedas* came to be called *Śruti* owing to this system of study.

Certain devices have been usefully adopted from very early times to keep the *Vedas* from becoming corrupt. Those devices have been five in number and known by the names *Saṁhitāpāṭha*, *Padapāṭha*, *Kramapāṭha*, *Jaṭāpāṭha* and *Ghanapāṭha*. The *Saṁhitāpāṭha* represents the Vedic passages as such and as they are recited. The *Padapāṭha* represents the stage in which the *Saṁhitā* is split up into words. If the *Saṁhitāpāṭha* were to be represented symbolically by *abc*, then *a*, *b*, *c*, would represent the *Padapāṭha*. Rules were framed and observed to account for the phonetic changes at the end and at the beginning of such words which were thus split up. This helped the restoration of the *Saṁhitāpāṭha* from the *Padapāṭha* as purely as it was before the *Padapāṭha* was formed out of it. The *Kramapāṭha* is formed by taking every word of the *Padapāṭha* once with the preceding word and then with the following word. This shall be symbolically represented as *ab*, *bc*, *ca*. The *Jaṭāpāṭha* is had by the combination of the *Kramapāṭha* stated in three ways. *ab*, *ba*, *ab*, *bc*, *cb*, *bc* would be the symbolic representation for this. The *Ghanapāṭha* is formed by the same combination stated in five ways. *ab*, *ba*, *abc*, *cba*, *abc* would represent this symbolically. With the help of these devices, the *Saṁhitā* is split up in four ways, the reconstruction of it being made possible from the four *pāṭhas*. Thus the Vedic texts have been kept intact from the very early times. Hence no change, even in a syllable or accent, has crept into them, notwithstanding the oral tradition through which they have been handed down to posterity.

CHAPTER III

VEDAS AS INTERPRETED BY THE ORIENTALISTS

In the course of their critical study of the *Vedas* which were treated side by side with the *Zend Avesta* the Zoroastrian scriptures, the scholars of the West were struck by the similarities in expressions in the *Vedas* and the *Zend Avesta*. The words cited by them were similar in sense and formation. For instance, *mitra* in the *Vedas* and *mihira* in the *Zend Avesta* were found to mean the sun; *Vṛtrahan* in the *Vedas* and *Verethraghna* in the *Zend Avesta* meant the war-god and were phonetically similar; *asura* in the *Vedas* and *ahura* in the *Zend Avesta* were phonetically similar but the former meant a demon while the latter a god; *Yama* in the *Vedas* meant the god of death while *Yima* in the *Zend Avesta* the lord of paradise and *soma* in the *Vedas* and *haoma* in the *Zend Avesta* meant a drink. So is the case with *aṁrta* in the *Vedas* and *amesha* in the *Zend Avesta*. People following both have been having initiation in the form of *upanayana*. On the strength of these similarities, the critics of the West have drawn the conclusion that from among the people who were living together ages ago in Persia and the neighbouring areas, one section moved east-ward and entered into India about 3000 B.C. The Western scholars designated them as Āryans. At first, they settled in Punjab where they were able to get a peaceful living. Grateful at this, they began to propitiate the forces of Nature deifying them. Their prayers, offered on these occasions, were composed in those expressions with which they were familiar during their settlement in the regions of Persia. Owing to the efflux of time since their departure from those regions, their language underwent certain phonetic changes. *Ṛgveda* was the name given to the work comprising these prayers. During their stay in Punjab, only a portion of the *Ṛgveda* was composed. As they moved further to the east, the remaining portions were composed. This is evident from the absence of references to the river Gañgā, to the animals like tiger, and to the food grains like rice in these portions. References to these are available in the portions written at a later period. Chapters (*maṇḍalas*) II-VII must have formed the nucleus of the *Ṛgveda*, composed as the hymns therein are by different seers. Chapters I and VIII contain hymns composed by the seers belonging to the same *Kāṇva* group. Chapters IX and X should have been composed at later periods by different seers. These last two chapters contain cosmogonic hymns, hymns of burial, spells and others and hymns which deify abstract ideas such as wrath, faith etc. The *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda* which contain the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were composed later in the regions lying on the banks of the river Yamunā. The *Atharvaveda* was composed after the Āryans settled in Bengal.

Not only were the *Vedas* composed at different periods but the portions in each were also composed at different periods. The early settlers, who expressed their gratitude to the deities by composing the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*, besought the help of those deities in the hour of need by reciting those hymns. At a certain stage, they found that mere prayers did not serve the purpose and that something beyond them was necessary to win the favour of the deities. They found, in the performance of the sacred rites, a better means to serve this purpose. "There was a time when the sacrifices" "were dictated by the free impulse of the human heart, by a yearning to render thanks to some unknown Being, and to repay, in words or deeds, a debt of gratitude, accumalated from the first breath of life."[1] The worship of fire, the drinking of *soma* juice and other rites formed the noteworthy features of these rites. · The hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were recited while performing these rites. With a view to ensure the correct performance of these rites, certain passages, of the *Veda* which gave a clue for the mode of preforming them, were taken up and expounded in order that they could be easily applied to their performance. These explanations and directions were recorded together with the corresponding hymns in a separate work which came to be called *Yajurveda*. On all these occasions, the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were sung and for the purpose of securing efficiency and effect in putting the hymns to music, the *Sāmaveda* was composed. It contained the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* together with the necessary rules and regulations to put them to music. When the ritual side was thus in progress, a need was felt to take steps for defending the sacrificer from the attack of enemies who did not lend support to the performance of such rites. Evidently these enemies were the savage tribes who were the original inhabitants of India and who attempted to resist the foreigners from settling on the Indian soil. Steps were also taken to attack and overpower such enemies. These attempts took the shape of hymns and rites connected with the various deities. All these came to be recorded in the *Atharvaveda*.

The sacred rites were as many as there were deites and as many as there were purposes. The explanatory part of these rites assumed the shape of special texts called *Brāhmaṇas*. The hymns and the rites were considered to be attached to each *Veda* and this resulted in the rise of the *Brāhamaṇas* attached to each *Veda*.

Most of these rites were to be performed by a man in the company of the members of his family or of his clan. A man, who, having spent the major part of his life with the members of his family, chose to lead a life of retirement in the forest, was expected not to give up the performance of the sacred rites all on a sudden. He was required to perform certain rites which suited him in the life of retirement. The hymns and the rites for him were given in the *Āraṅyakas*. They are many being connected with each *Veda* llke the Brāhmaṇas.

---

[1] History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature by Max Muller. P. 525

Those who settled thus in the forests would have liked to ascertain the basis for the performance of the sacred rites, the nature of the man performing them, the nature of the deity propitiated and such other details. Some of these people would have got tired of following the path of rituals. They would have aspired to understand the nature of the soul. Questions and answers on these topics must have sprung during this period. All these were collected together in the form of works called *Upaniṣads*. These also formed part of the *Vedas* and were attached to the concluding portions of the *Āraṇyakas*. The nature of the speculations contained in them shows that some of them must have been composed long time ago.

Although the division of the *Veda* is in this order, still it appears that portions, under each head in the different *Vedas*, were composed at different periods. The *Sāmaveda* was composed long before the portions of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* were written.

The hymns of the *Ṛgveda* are associated singly and also in groups with the names of certain sages. It is possible to treat these sages as the authors of these hymns. In some cases, the names of the authors of these hymns have been forgotten. The entire text of the *Ṛgveda* must therefore be taken to have been written by different authors at different periods. The same conclusion holds good in the case of the texts of the other *Vedas*. The earlier portions of the *Ṛgveda* were composed about 3000 B.C. The *Vedas*, in their entirety, were available before 600 B.C. when Gautama Buddha preached his doctrines opposing certain doctrines recorded in them.

The critics of the West, when they undertook the critical study of the *Vedas*, took for consultation the commentaries on the *Vedas* written by the Indian writers. The explanations, offered in these commentaries for certain passages, were found unconvincing and misleading. The Western scholars therefore thought it wise to interpret the pasages from the context. The *Vedas*, the *Ṛgveda* in particular, did not appear to them to contain a word unusual, difficult or obscure necessitating a reference to the commentaries. Of course, they took the help of the commentaries but did not treat them as the sole guides for the interpretation of the *Vedas*. 'As regards its more peculiar and difficult portions,' they thought, 'it must therefore be interpreted mainly through itself.'[1] These scholars were of the opinion that a European scholar, qualified for this study, possessed the historical faculty and had a wide intellectual horizon equipped as he was with the resources of scientific scholarship. Further, he is aided by the results of comparative philology. Above all, he is unfettered by theological bias. He is therefore better fitted than a Brahmin interpreter for arriving at the true and the original meaning of the *Vedas*.

In the opinion of these scholars, a study of the *Vedas* reveals that the early settlers in ancient India were pastoral people. Their

---

1. A History of Sanskrit Literature by A. A. Macdonell. P. 63

houses were made of wood. Their food consisted of ghee, milk, grains, vegetables, fruits and meat. Their vessels were made of metals or earthenware. The drinking vessels were made of wood. The use of liquor was restricted. Cattle-breeding was the main occupation in the earlier stages. Later on, agriculture and hunting came to be practised. In order to defend themselves from the attacks of their enemies, the Āryans had to practise warfare. The bow and the arrows were the weapons used for this purpose. Armours and helmets were made of metal. Boats were used for crossing the streams and rivers. Barter was the system of exchange. Gambling and dice were practised. Dancing and music became developed. The drum, flute and lute were the instruments of music. Among the domestic animals, the cow occupied a prominent position. "The sanctity of the cow has not only survived in India down to the present day, but has even gathered strength with the lapse of time". "To no other animal has mankind owed so much, and the debt has been richly repaid in India with a veneration unknown in other lands."[1]

Patriarchy was the mode of the family system. A priest was at their home as their guide. The marriage customs were the same as those which prevail in the present day. The women occupied a prominent position in the house. She was called *gṛhapatnī*. The birth of a son was looked upon as a prosperous event. Those who were sonless adopted another's son.

The caste-system took a definite shape during this period. This system was evolved to maintain the social standard of the society and was based on the nature of avocations pursued by the people. There were wheelwrights, carpenters, weavers who made clothes from wool, ropemakers, jewellers, actors and many other classes of people who pursued different walks of life.

The Āryans were split up into numerous tribes, each tribe representing a political unit. Monarchical was the system of government. Kingship was hereditary. The power of the king was controlled by the will of the people. In war, the chariots were employed. The horses and elephants, through referred to in the earlier portions of the *Vedas*, do not appear to have been used by the early settlers for purposes of war.

The standard of morality was very high. Adultery and rape were counted as the most serious among the offences. Monogamy and the virtues of practising it were fully recognised. Yet, polygamy thrived along with it.

Burial and cremation were the the two means adopted to dispose of the dead. Cremation was more common and burial, particularly in the later period, became restricted in its applicability to specific cases.

While the *Ṛk*, *Yajus*, and *Sāmavedas* throw light on the religious and secular aspects of the life of the early settlers, the *Atharvaveda*

---

1. A History of Sanskrit Literature by A. A. Macdonell. P. 110

contains a mine of information on the secular side alone. Spells and charms were in use to combat diseases and enemies and to get prosperity in the house and in trade. Useful information is given on the topics connected with medicine, astrology and astronomy.

The *Vedas* in general, besides containing hymns and directions for the performance of the sacred rites, contain hymns connected with wedding, funeral and other happenings. Cosmogonic and didactic hymns are found in plenty. Events connected with the lives of Śunaḥśepha, Purūravas and Urvaśi, Yama and Yami and others are found included.

During the earlier period in the Vedic age, the Āryans worshipped the forces of Nature. The universe was divided into three groups of earth, air and heaven. Sun, Dawn, Fire, Wind, Lightning, Rain and others were personified and worshipped. The Āryans were struck with some features in these such as, brilliance, power, beneficence, wisdom etc. These features were found in common with almost all the deities worshipped and hence tended to obscure the distinctive ones. In some cases, the individual ones were maintained. This resulted in grouping some deities into pairs, or in a collection, e.g. Mitrāvaruṇa, Dyāvāpṛthivī, Maruts, Rudras, Vasus, Ādityas and others. The gods were considered to have had a beginning[1]. They were later immortalised. Physical features were attributed to them but these features lacked definiteness of outline and were shadowy. The tongue and limbs of Agni were his flames. The arms of Sūrya were his rays. However there is no reference to the idols and idol-worship in the *Vedas*. The gods were considered to be exclusively beneficent, bestowing long life, upholding moral order and guarding honesty and virtue.

Among the gods, Varuṇa, Indra and Agni were prominent. Varuṇa was the great upholder of the moral order (*ṛta*). He releases men not only from the sins which they themselves commit, but from those committed by their forefathers. He is the only ethical God of the Āryans. His origin is to be traced to the period when the Āryans lived with Zoroastrians. Shortly after the Āryans settled in Punjab, Varuṇa's eminence waned and he was reduced to the position of the lord of the sea. This is clear from the absence of theistic nature of the hymns addressed to other deities in the nuclear portion of the *Ṛgveda* and the portions added later. Indra also came to lose in the later period his eminent position as the most favourite god in charge of rain but continued to hold his position as the lord of gods. Agni continued to maintain his position, as he was, more than others, intimately connected with the sacred rites. Savitṛ, Sūrya. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and others are given prominence in the earlier portions and they have become more popular at the end of the Vedic period. Rātri, Pṛthivī, Sarasvatī and other goddesses came to be worshipped. The all-comprehensive group Viśvedevāḥ became popular in the middle of the Vedic period. Another special feature is the deification of the attributes like *śraddhā*, *manyu*, *kāma* and others.

---

[1] *Ṛgveda* I. 85-2

The prominent feature regarding the nature of worship of these deities is each deity is praised as the highest in the particular context. Max Muller termed this as Henotheism or Kathenotheism. "When Agni, the lord of fire, is addressed by the poet, he is spoken of as the first god, not inferior even to Indra . While Agni is invoked, Indra is forgotten, there is no competition between the two, nor any rivalry between them or other gods. This is a most important feature in the religion of the *Veda*."[1]

Thus Kathenotheism and polytheism could be said to have characterised the religion of the *Vedas* in the early period. There is always a pantheistic current throughout the period, as is evidenced by the statements 'All is God'. The later period recognises God as personal and as the creator. Polytheism of the early period gave room to monotheism.

No reference is found in the *Vedas* leaving the *Upaniṣads* to the discussions regarding the existence of souls. After long periods of trials, the souls were yearning for eternal rest. Hence the Āryans set a high value for the future at the risk of the present. This made the Āryans recognise two goals for the dead viz.. the path of the gods and the path of the fathers. Firm believers, as they were in the theory of transmigration of souls, they did not doubt the existence of the souls and hence the *Vedas*, particularly the early portions, breathe a spirit of optimism thus proving that the early settlers had belief in a better status after death.

---

[1] History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature by Max Muller. P. 546

CHAPTER IV

A CRITICISM OF THE ORIENTALISTS' VIEW ABOUT THE VEDAS

The results achieved by the Western scholars through their study of the Vedic texts were summarised in the previous chapter. The critics have expressed in unmistakable words what they considered about the *Vedas* and their contents. The opinion of the Indians on this subject is worth being referred to here. Before this is taken up, there is need to study the conclusions drawn by the Western scholars.

There is close affinity between the *Vedas* and the *Zend Avesta* in regard to the words used in them and certain religious rites recorded in them. Recently it is found that the same kind of affinity exists between the *Vedas* and the records of the Hittites, a nation which occupied the territories of Syria and Asia Minor in the third millenium B.C. These records are kept in the museums of Istanbul and Ankara in Turkey. Similarities of this kind between the languages of one nation and another prove that one of those nations should have been influenced by the other. They might have existed together for a long time and got separated at a later period. The nation which got thus separated could have retained the impressions in the language and practices of the parental stock. As regards the *Vedas* and the *Zend Avesta*, there is no evidence to prove that the nation which is said to have composed the *Vedas* on entering into India lived originally along with the Zoroastrians. There is nothing to show that the Āryans entered into India from the West. The arguments of the Western scholars could as well prove that the Zoroastrians and the Hittites were original inhabitants of India and that they migrated to the West in the third millenium B.C. There is no evidence either in support of or against these contentions. Similarities however have to be proved to be the results of cultural and political contacts which India had with the Persian and Hittite empires from very early times. It is only in this way that justification may be offered to explain the close affinity borne to the Indian habits by the culture of the people of Mexico and other regions in South America. In recent years, the contact of the Indians with the Europeans, particularly the British, has influenced the Indian people in the matter of outlook on life, dress and manners. Contacts like this could have taken place in early days between the nations of the world. The theory of Āryan immigration as formulated by the Western scholars is unsupported by any evidence whatsoever. Hence the land of the *Vedas* should have been India alone whose western frontiers extended beyond Afghanistan and Baluchistan.

The scholars of the West have attempted to prove that the *Ṛgveda* and following it the other *Vedas* were the earliest compositions of the

Āryans. The *Vedas* are essentially religious in nature and contain only some occasional touches of secular life. The *Ṛgveda* contains 1017 hymns which are incorporated in the other *Vedas*. The *Ṛgveda* had twenty-one recensions, the *Yajurveda* one hundred, the *Sāmaveda* one thousand and the *Atharvaveda* nine[1]. Many of these recensions of each *Veda* are now lost leaving a few among them. The seers who are said to have composed so many hymns and so many recensions should have also composed certain compositions on secular life. Since never was secular life completely dissociated from the religious life, even these compostions should have been tinged by religious spirit. Some of these must have been included in the *Brāhmaṇas* and others could have got included in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata* and *Purāṇas*. They could be identified as the *Ākhyānas*, *Upākhyānas* and *Itihāsas*.

As regards the periods and order of the compositions of the various portions of the *Vedas*, there is no direct evidence to prove that some portions of the *Ṛgveda* formed the nucleus of the Vedic texts. If the *maṇḍalas* II-VII were composed at first, they could have been numbered as *maṇḍalas* I-VI. The evidences based on the nature of authorship and deification of the abstract ideas are all conjectural . We are to be guided by the order of the text as it is now available and there is no use in imagining, in the absence of authentic evidences, that the order of the compostion must have been different from that found in the arrangement of the *maṇḍalas* in the present text of the *Ṛgveda*. The tenth *maṇḍala* actually refers to the *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda*. This shows that the sacrifices have been performed making use of all the three *Vedas*. The Vedic seers could not have simply remained quiet having sung in praise of the gods. They should have taken steps to perform some rites making use of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. Hence it is not proper to hold that the *Vedas* and the portions thereof were composed at different periods.. For the same reason, it is not possible to prove that the portions of the Vedic texts were composed at different places. It is not possible to show that while a section of the Āryans was engaged in the pursuit of sacred rites in Punjab and was following a particular way of life, there was no other section of the Āryans in other parts of the land following the same practices.

Since the theory of the Āryan immigration cannot be proved, the date or dates of the compostion of the *Vedas* do not admit of discussion here. When at all could they have been composed shall be dealt with presently. In this connection, it is proper to refer to the traditional conception of the *Vedas*. *Veda* is that which teaches that means, which is not worldly, by adopting which what is desirable is obtained and what is undesirable is avoided.

Vide :—इष्टप्राप्त्यनिष्टपरिहारयोरलौकिकमुपायं यो ग्रन्थो वेदयति स वेदः ।

Sāyaṇa's Introduction to his *Taittirīyasaṁhitābhāṣya*

---

[1] *Mahābhāṣya* 1. 1. 1

The means so taught is unworldly because it cannot be got through perception or inference.

Vide :—प्रत्यक्षेणानुमित्या वा यस्तूपायो न वुध्यते ।
एतं विदन्ति वेदेन तस्माद्वेदस्य वेदता ।।

The *Vedas* are threefore of unquestioned authority. They are of two divisions viz., *Karmakāṇḍa* and *Jñānakāṇḍa*. The former comprises the *Saṁhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions and the latter the Upaniṣadic portion. The former is concerned with the performance of the rites enjoined in them. Such rites are four viz., *nitya* obligatory, *naimittika* necessitated by a special cause, *kāmya* performed through the desire of obtaining specific results and *niṣiddha* prohibited. The *Jñānakāṇḍa* deals with the nature of the individual souls, Supreme Soul and the world and the relation between them. Traditional view is the same as that of the Western scholars regarding the aim and purpose of the *Brāhmaṇa*, *Āraṇyaka* and *Upaniṣad*.

Regarding the authorship of the *Vedas*, three views have been current in the Indian tradition. According to one of them, the *Vedas* are not the compostions of any human being. They are eternal and *apauruṣeya* transcending human origin. The *Vedas* deal with the nature of Gods and of the sacrifices performed to worship them. They also contain eternal truths. All these are reflected from the intuition of the sages who are only the media for the flow of the Vedic poetry. The names of the sages whose intuition brought down particular hymns are associated with them. They are *ṛṣis*, that is, knowers. They are seers, *draṣṭāraḥ*. They are not the authors or composers of any of these hymns. They could rather be taken to have been responsible for the propagation of the Vedic ideals.

Vide :—समाख्यानं प्रवचनाद्वाक्यत्वत्त्वं तु पराहतम् ।

तत्कर्त्रनुपलम्भेन स्यात्ततोऽपौरुषेयता ।।
Jaiminīyanyāyamālā 1. 2. 8

Not being the compostions of any body, they are themselves valid. For the benefit of humanity, the Supreme Being reveals them at the time of creation[1]. That they are eternal, in spite of having been revealed at the time of creation, is justified by taking the truths and contents therein to be the same as in the previous periods of worldly existence. This view is held by the *Vedāntins*. Another view is that the world was never created nor was it ever destroyed. The *Vedas* have been eternally existent. They are *apauruṣeya* and intrinsically valid. This view is held by the *Mīmāṁsakas*. The third view is that the *Vedas* are the compostions of the Supreme Being. Being the compositions of the ever flawless God, they are valid. This view has been advocated by the *Nyāya* school of Indian thought. From this, it is clear that Indian tradition never believed in attributing the *Vedas* or portions thereof to human authorship.

---

[1] *Ṛgveda* 10-90-9

As regards the interpretation of the *Vedas*, it must be admitted that the line of traditional interpretation is not an unbroken one. There were many attempts made to interpret the *Vedas* before Yāska (before 800 B.C.) who wrote his *Nirukta* on the etymology of the Vedic words and who speaks of seventeen interpreters of the *Vedas* prior to him. None of these works are now available. The alternative explanations offered by Yāska show his sincerity in offering a better and reasonable interpretation thus showing that he was not satisfied with the interpretations available then as handed down by tradition. After Yāska, the *Vedas* were commented by many Indian scholars. The *Ṛgveda* was commented by Skandasvāmin (600 A.D.), Mādhavabhaṭṭa (9 th century A.D.) Veṅkaṭamādhava (11th entury A.D.), Ānandatīrtha, Jayatīrtha and Srīnivāsatīrtha, the leading exponents of the *Dvaita* system of *Vedānta*, Mādhava also known as Mādhavārya who wrote his *Ṛgarthadīpikā* before Sāyaṇa (before 1350 A.D), Sāyaṇa who wrote the *Vedārthaprakāśa*, Udgītācārya, Devarāja-Yajvan, Bhaṭṭabhāskara, Govindasvāmin and Saḍguruśiṣya. The *Śuklayajurveda* was commented by Harisvāmin (7th century A.D.), Udaya (850 A.D.), Uvaṭa who wrote in the 11th century his brief *Mantrabhāṣya*, Mahīdhara also known as Mahīdāsa, Sāyaṇa and others. The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* was commented by Sāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭabhāskara, Kapardisvāmin, Bhavasvāmin (C. 1300 A.D.), Guhadeva and others. The *Sāmaveda* was commented by Sāyaṇa, Mādhava in his Vivaraṇa and Bharatasvāmin. The *Atharvaveda* was commented by Sāyaṇa. Sāyaṇa alone commented on all the four *Vedas*. Others commented on one *Veda* fully or on portions thereof.

The commentators mentioned above belonged to the line of scholars who studied and understood the *Vedas* and performed the rites enjoined therein. They were therefore quite familiar with the words together with their imports as they occurred in the particular contexts of the *Vedas*. Being thus qualified to interpret them they have been the reliable exponents of the Vedic tradition. In the introductions to his commentaries on the four *Vedas*, Sāyaṇa gives valuable information on the nature of the *Vedas* and their interpretation. He notices the objections raised by some people against the interpretation of the *Vedas* on the ground of many of the Vedic passages having become unintelligible and meets those objections in a convincing way. While interpreting the Vedic passages, he makes use of his knowledge of the *Mīmāmsā* rules of interpretation. He takes into consideration the valuable help rendered by the six supplements शिक्षा, व्याकरण, छन्दस, निरुक्तम्, ज्योतिष and कल्प The commentaries of Sāyaṇa and others could not be dismissed as valueless, because of the difficulty experienced by modern scholars in fully comprehending the sense of their interpretations. The tecnhical terms connected with the Vedic ritual could be properly understood only with the aid of the traditional commentaries of the *Vedas*. Besides, the contents of the epics and *Purāṇas*, which are based on the Vedic texts and Vedic tradition, play a very important part in helping the Vedic student in understanding the proper sense of the Vedic texts.

Vide :—इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपवृंहयेत् ।

Mahābhārata. Ādiparva I. 293

The Vedic scholars of the West, professing a cultural outlook different from that of the Indians, have chosen to treat the epics and the *Purāṇas* as legendary and mythological, thus having no relation to the Vedic texts. They have undertaken an independent line of interpretation regardless of the Vedic tradition recorded in the traditional commentaries. Hence the method adopted by these scholars, though it could be acclaimed as scientific and historical, could not be treated as the the reliable mode of interpretation capable of bringing out the real estimate of the *Vedas* and the Vedic tradition.

Being essentially religious in content and nature, the *Vedas* do not contain any account of the secular life of the ancient people. What is available as throwing light on secular life is meagre. The Vedic scholars of the West sought to find references and information about the secular life of the Āryans in the *Vedas*. Unable to get support for their findings from the traditional commentaries of the *Vedas*, they must have chosen to adopt an independent line of interpretation of the *Vedas*.

The interpretation offered by the Western scholars about the religion of the Vedic literature requires careful study. That the early Āryan settlers in Punjab were struck with wonder at the forces of Nature and began to worship deifying them seeking protection from them is yet to be proved. If it is held that the Āryans propitiated the force of Nature, they must have treated them with dread and should have tried to appease them. In that case, there is no room for any reference to their having worshipped them. If it is held that they worshipped the forces of Nature, then it must be admitted that they must have had a knowledge of the real nature of gods and their religious attitude must have been one of love mingled with veneration. Admiration of the greatest rises spontaneously only when we know it. Expression of fear in some cases is to be interpreted as that of a fear associated with the conscience rather than that of the unknown terrors of the forces of Nature. Since the *Vedas* speak of the sacrifices and enjoin the performance of them as a means of worshipping the gods, it is to be admitted that the seers associated with the hymns of the *Vedas* and those who undertook the performance of sacrifices had the realisation of the nature of god. The seers could not be taken to have been struck with fear and bewilderment at the forces of Nature nor can it be proved that they worshipped or propitiated them. The *Saṁskṛta* equivalent for the sacrifice is *yāga*. This word is derived from the root *yaj* whose meaning is given as देवपूजासङ्गतिकरणदानेषु. That is, the root *yaj* means worship of God, communion or association with God, and offering something to God. The word *yāga* therefore presupposes the knowledge of God whose worship is to be carried out by means of performing the sacrifice. Hence the reasonable conclusion that can be drawn regarding the religion of the *Vedas* is that the conception of God was highly developed since the time when the *Vedas* were available to humanity.

Regarding the polytheistic, kathenotheistic, pantheistic and monotheistic tendencies pointed out by the Western scholars in the development of faith of the Vedic religion, it must be borne in mind that these terms polytheism, kathenotheism, pantheism and monotheism were framed by the Western scholars for purposes of application to their religion and to the religions or religious beliefs held by peoples different from themselves. Wherever there is theism, there is the awakening that the mortals are sinners. The outbursts of the emotions of the devotees get exhibited in concrete forms. All these are peculiar to each land. It is not therefore fair to judge the religious beliefs of a particular nation by the standards set by a different nation. In India the conception of God had its own growth and development. God is transcendent and immanent. His universal presence is found in Nature also . This must not be confounded with Nature worship or pantheism. The concept of many deities, designated by the Western scholars as polytheism, is expressive of the catholicity of the Indian thinkers. This is only recognizing that the Supreme Being is known in many ways and worshipped in many forms. The religion of the *Vedas* shall therefore be described as monotheism.

That Varuṇa alone was the upholder of the moral order (*ṛta*) and was the only ethical God in the Vedic pantheon cannot also be maintained. The Vedic commentators do not know the word *ṛta* as conveying the sense of moral order. This word is found used in the sense of sacrifice.[1] Not only Varuṇa, but other deities like Agni[2] and others[3] are spoken of as the guardians of *ṛta*. It must not be held that Varuṇa alone had ethical significance and prayers were offered to him for communion and redemption,[4] for prayers of the same kind are offered to other deities as well, *e.g.*, Agni,[5] Mitra,[6] Sūrya,[7] Āpaḥ,[8] Savitṛ,[9] and others. Hence it must be admitted that monotheism was the religion of the *Vedas* and the Supreme Being revealed Himself to the seers and sages through Agni, Sūrya, Āpaḥ, Varuṇa and others. Hence the justification for the Ṛgvedic passage एक सत् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं मातरिश्वानमाहुः ॥ *Ṛgveda I*– 164

This aspect of monotheism is found developed fully in the other *Vedas*, *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*.

Thus according to the Indian tradition, the four *Vedas* form the sources of *dharma*. They are eternal and intrinsically valid. They are not the compostions of any human being.

Vide :—वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलम् ।

Manusmṛti II-6

---

1. *Ṛgveda* V. 62. 1 *Cf. Ṛgveda* IV—7-7
2. „ I. 1. 8 ; III—10-2 : VI—3-1 3, *Ṛgveda* I—16 3-5
4. „ VII—86-8 5. *Ṛgveda* 1—189-1 ; I. 1. 9. 6. „ III—59
7. „ VII—63-6 8. „ VII4-9 9. „ V—82-5

CHAPTER V

SAṀHITĀ, BRĀHMAṆA AND ĀRAṆYAKA PORTIONS OF THE VEDAS

The *Ṛgvedasaṁhitā* consists of 1017 hymns or 1028 hymns including the *Vālakhilya* hymns. It is divided into ten sections called *maṇḍalas*. It is also divided into eight sections each being called *aṣṭaka*. The latter division is being followed by the Indian tradition. Among the recensions of this *Vedas*, the *Śākala* recension alone is available.

The *Yajurvedasaṁhitā* comprises the hymns taken from the *Ṛgveda* and the prose passages which are explanatory of the Ṛgvedic hymns from the ritualistic aspect. Hence this *Veda* is partly in verse and partly in prose. This *Veda* has two main divisions viz., *Śuklayajurveda* and *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The former came to be called *śukla* because of the well arranged plan of the hymns. This name is justified also on the ground of this *Veda* having been revealed by the sun. The latter school came to be called *kṛṣṇa* due to the unarranged nature of its contents. The former branch has only the hymns to be recited while the latter has, in addition to them, the explanatory portions on the performance of the sacred rites.

The *Saṁhitā* of the *Śuklayajurveda* is known as *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā*. The word *vāja* means food, *sani* means offering and *vājasani* means the sage who had the offering of food. His son was Vājasaneya, otherwise known as Yājñavalkya. It is he that taught this *Veda* to his fifteen pupils. Hence this *Saṁhitā* came to be called *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā*. Among the pupils of Yājñavalkya, Kaṇva and Madhyanadina were prominent and through them arose two recensions of this *Veda* with the names *Kāṇvaśākhā* and *Mādhyandinaśākhā*. This *Saṁhitā* has forty chapters of which the last fifteen are considered to have been added later. According to the Indian tradition, chapters 26-35 are considered to be supplementary (*khila*). This *Saṁhitā* deals with important sacrifices like *Vājapeya*, *Rajasūya*, *Aśvamedha*, *Sarvamedha* and others. The last chapter contains the *Iśopaniṣad*.

The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* has at present four recensions viz., 1. *Kāṭhakasaṁhitā* 2. *Kapiṣṭhla Kaṭhasaṁhitā* available in fragments, 3. *Maitrāyaṇīsaṁhitā* also called as *Kālāpasaṁhitā* and 4. *Taittirīyasaṁhitā* having a large following in South India. The last mentioned recension has two schools called *Āpastamba* and *Hiraṇyakeśin*, the distinction between them being on the side of the rituals. The former three recensions are also called by a comprehensive name '*Caraka*'. The third recension has four sections (*kāṇḍas*) while the fourth has seven.

The *Sāmavedasaṁhitā* comprises for the most part the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. There are only seventy-five hymns which belong exclusively to this *Veda*. This *Veda* contains on the whole 1810 hymns many of them being repeated. These are divided into two parts called *Ārcika* and *Uttarārcika*. The former represents the collections of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* while the latter is a subsequent collection of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. Leaving aside the repetitions, the first part has 585 hymns and the second has 400 hymns. The hymns in the second part are grouped according to the metres in which they are composed, the deities to whom they are addressed and the sacrifices while performing which they are to be sung. This *Saṁhitā* contains various song books called *Gaṇas* which give the rules for the prolongation, repetition and other changes to be effected while the hymns are sung. Among the thousand recensions, only three are now available viz., *Rāṇāyanīya*, *Kauthuma* and *Jaiminīya* also called as *Talavakāra*. The *Saṁhitās* of the first and the third are available, while that of the second is available only for the seventh chapter.

The *Atharvaveda* is also called by the names *Atharvāṅgiras*, *Bhṛgvaṅgiras* and *Brahmaveda*. The Western scholars find, in the word *atharva*, a reference to the holy magic which was used to overcome diseases and thus used for constructive purposes and, in the word *Aṅgiras*, a reference to that made use of for offensive and destructive purposes. The word *atharvan* is taken to refer to the priest and the wizard mixed in one. The *Saṁhitā* of this *Veda* is preserved in two recensions viz., *Śaunaka* and *Paippalāda*. The former is well known while the latter is preserved in a single manuscript. The former has 731 hymns divided in twenty-one books. One-sixth of the entire portion is in prose.

BRĀHMAṆAS

Brāhmaṇa comprises the explanations offered by the learned priests on the essential points of the rituals. The collections of such explanations varied according to the variety of the rituals. These explanations mention the connections between the hymns and the rites in which they are to find use. They contain accurate and minute directions regarding the performance of the sacred rites like the places to be occupied by the priests around the altar, the positions to be occupied by the sacred grass and others. In support of these explanations, they contain certain anecdotes. A sacred rite required the offices of four priests viz., *Hotṛ*, *Udgātṛ*, *Adhvaryu* and *Brahman*. They are respectively connected with the *Ṛk*, *Sāma*, *Yajus* and *Atharvavedas*. The *Adhvaryu* was in charge of the actual performance of the sacrifice. The *Hotṛ* was to recite the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* in a loud and distinct tone and in the most accurate manner. The *Udgātṛ* was to sing the hymns according to the rules of the *Sāmaveda*. The *Brahman* was to watch the doings of the other priests and correct the mistakes if they commit any. He was expected to have mastered all the *Vedas* and be proficient with the details of the rituals.

While the *Saṁhitā* portions of the *Vedas* have recensions, the *Brāhmaṇas* have none. Yet, they are different according as the rites are and the recensions of the *Vedas* according to which the particular rites are performed.

To the *Ṛgveda* belong the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* in forty chapters and *Kauṣītakībrāmaṇa* also called *Sāṅkhyāyanabrāhmaṇa* in thirty chapters. To the *Śuklayajurveda* is attached the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* in the *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina* recensions. It contains one hundred chapters grouped in fourteen sections (*kāṇḍas*). The first nine sections contain a comment on the first eighteen sections of the *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā*. The sage Yājñavalkya is mentioned as the author of this *Brāhmaṇa*. The concluding portions contain the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*. This *Brāhmaṇa* contains the stories of the fish, Śakuntalā Purūravas and Urvaśi and others. The recension of the *Kāṇva* school has eighteen books. The *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa* is attached to the *Taittirīyasaṁhitā*. The other recensions of this *Veda* have no *Brāhmaṇa*. *Brāhmaṇas* are available in the *Sāmaveda* schools of *Taṇḍins* and *Talavakāras* while the *Kauthuma* recension has no *Brāhmaṇa*. The *Pancaviṁśabrāhmaṇa* and *Saḍviṁśabrāhmaṇa* are attached to the *Tāṇḍya* recension. The former is also called by the names *Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa* and *Prauḍhabrāhmaṇa*. The title *Pañcaviṁśabrāhmaṇa* must have been suggested by the number twentyfive of the books contained in it. The title *Saḍviṁśabrāhmaṇa* is suggested by its containing one more book in continuation of the *Pañcaviṁśabrāhmaṇa*. The last six chapters in the *Saḍviṁśabrāhmaṇa* are called *Adbhutabrāhmaṇa* which deal with the rites done for the prevention of the evil effects that are likely to take place on extraordinary occasions. The *Talavakārabrāhmaṇa* in five books is attached to the *Talavakāra* recension. The fourth book here is called *Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa* containing two lists of teachers of the *Sāmaveda* tradition and also the *Kenopaniṣad*. The last book is called *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* containing a list of the composers of the *Sāmans* which are particular kinds of the verses of the *Sāmaveda*. The *Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa* is also attached to the *Tāṇḍya* recension but it contains very little matter of the *Brāhmaṇa* type. Except for the beginning, it is *Chāndogyopaniṣad*. Besides these, there are three works attached to the *Sāmaveda* all of them called *Brāhmaṇas* only in name, as their contents deal with some other topics. These are the *Vaṁśabrāhmaṇa* containing a list of the teachers, *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* on chanting the hymns and *Devatādhyāyabrāhmaṇa* on the deities invoked in the *Sāmaveda*. To the *Atharvaveda*, is attached the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* which is available in two books. Except for the *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa* and *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, the *Brāhmaṇas* are unaceented.

ĀRAṆYAKAS

To the *Ṛgveda* are attached the *Aitareyāraṇyaka* in eighteen chapters attributed to Āśvalāyana and the *Kauṣītakyāraṇyaka* in fifteen chapters. The first third portion of the fourteenth section of the

Śatapathabrāhmaṇa is the *Āraṇyaka* of the *Śuklayajurveda*. The *Taittirīyrāaṇyaka*, attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*, is in continuation of the *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa* and is accented. The first section in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* represents the *Āraṇyaka* of the *Tāṇḍya* recension of the *Sāmaveda*. The *Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa* attached to the *Talavakāra* recension is, in fact, an *Āraṇyaka* of this recension. The *Atharvaveda* has no *Āraṇyaka*.

All these three portions of the *Vedas* represent the *Karmakāṇḍa*. For purposes of the rituals, the literature, contained in these portions, is divided, by Indian tradition, into three parts viz., *mantra*, *vidhi* and *arthavāda*. The *mantra* portion deals with the hymns which are to be recited when the sacrifices are to be performed. The second part contains the directions enjoining the mode of performing a particular rite and prohibiting certain rites. The third part refers to the portions of the *Vedas* which explain the directions given in the second part and offer justifications for such directions.

The Western critics place the *Karmakāṇḍa* of all the *Vedas* in the following chronological order as they are taken to have been composed: *Saṁhitā* of the *Ṛgveda*, *Yajurvedasaṁhitā*, *Sāmavedasaṁhitā*, *Pañcaviṁśabrāhmaṇa*, *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa*, *Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa*, *Kauṣītakībrāhmaṇa*, *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*, *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* and *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*.

CHAPTER VI

UPANIṢAD

Those who perform the rites prescribed in the *Karmakāṇḍa* go to heaven and have to return to earth after a definite time. Heaven is not a place of permanent bliss. Hence one who is after everlasting bliss has to withdraw his mind gradually from the objects of the world. The purpose of the *Āraṇyakas* is to give a preliminary training in this direction to those who desire to get everlasting bliss. The next stage comes when the need arises to get discriminative knowledge which would help in understanding the value of the elementary principles needed at this stage as contrasted from all other principles of a subsidiary character. The need for this stage in a man's life is emphasised in the *Upaniṣads* which represent the *Jñānakāṇḍa*. After death, the soul migrates into another body as a result of the acts done in the previous birth. This kind of migration binds the soul to the body once again thus making the soul go in a mad search for material happiness. The *Upaniṣads* teach these principles and help the soul to desist from such pursuits. In the *Upaniṣads* are therefore found the evolution and growth of the theory of transmigration of souls. "Here in the *Upaniṣadas* are set forth in concrete examples as well as in dogmatic instruction, two opposing theories of life an ignorant, narrow, selfish way of life which seeks temporary, unsatisfying, unreal ends; and a way of life which seeks to relate itself to the Supreme Reality of the universe so as to escape from the needless misery of ordinary existence into undying bliss."[1] To achieve this purpose, the *Upaniṣads* deal with the nature of the individual souls, the Supreme Soul and the world and their mutual relation. The individual soul is referred to as *ātman* and *jīva*. The Supreme Soul is referred to as *Brahman* and *Ātman*. The *Upaniṣads* do not condemn the observance of the rituals. They recognise the observance of obligatory rites as a preliminary step to get to the higher step of knowledge (*jñāna*) which alone would lead the soul to the final goal.

The *Aitareya Upaniṣad* is attached to the *Ṛgveda*. It describes the creation of the universe and teaches that true knowledge could put a stop to the transmigration of the souls. The *Kauṣītakyupaniṣad* is also attached to the *Ṛgveda*. It deals with the knowledge of the soul. The *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, attached to the *Śuklayajurveda*, discusses the question of the origin of life for a soul and deals at length with its fears and happiness. Great stress is placed on the need for the meditation on the soul. It contains the conversational accounts between sage Yājñavalkya and king Janaka and others on the nature of the soul and the means to realise it. The *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, attached to the *Taittirīyasaṁhitā*, deals with the nature of the *Brahman* and this discussion is given in the form of a dialogue between Varuṇa and his son Bhṛgu. The *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* also called *Yājñikopaniṣad* is also attached to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. To the same recension are attached the *Kaṭhopaniṣad* and *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, the former contains two books each having three chapters. It gives the story of Naciketas who obtained the knowledge of the *Brahman* from the lord of death. The soul, on account of ignorance, is not able to show itself and realise its nature as distinct from the body. One can overcome death by understanding its nature. It is meditation that helps in the realisation of the nature of the Supreme and individual souls. The *Śvetāśvatara* contains the discourse of the sage Śvetāśvatara delivered to the people in his hermitage. The object of this *Upaniṣad* is to bring about a reconciliation between the *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* and *Vedānta* systems of thought. The nature of the relationship between illusion (*māyā*), individual souls and the Supreme Soul is also discussed. The *Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad* is attached to the *Maitrāyaṇīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The *Iśopaniṣad*, forming part of the *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā*, tells that those who get the knowledge of the *Brahman* would find everything identical with it which is seen in the universe which, in its turn, is found in it. To the *Tāṇḍya* recension of the Sāmaveda is attached the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* which is didactic in form. It contains many dialogues between sage Uddālaka and his son Śvetaketu. The idea of the universal soul is discussed in this work. To the *Talavakāra* recension is attached the *Kenopaniṣad* which speaks of the *Brahman*, as the only absolute and the source of all forces in the world. The nature of the *Brahman* is entirely different from things known and unknown. The *Muṇḍaka*, *Praśna* and *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣads* are attached to the *Atharvaveda*. Strictly speaking, these are not connected with any school. From the *Muṇḍaka*, it is learnt that the *Brahman* dwells in the heart of man as the true self. Knowledge is two-fold viz., higher and lower. The former is concerned with the knowledge of the *Brahman* and the latter with the teachings of the *Vedas*. The *Praśnopaniṣad* is in the form of questions addressed by six students to the sage Pippalāda who answers them. It deals with the origin of matter, life, division of life, three states of existence viz., dream, sleep and waking and meditation on the *praṇava*. The *Māṇḍukya* deals with the infinite nature of the *Brahman*.

---

[1] Robert Ernest Hume ; Translation of the Thirteen Principal Upanisads : Preface vii

Almost all these *Upaniṣads* are only the continuations of the *Brāhmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions of the *Vedas*. The *Taittirīya* and *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣads* are accented. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Māṇḍūkya*, *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya*, *Maitrāyaṇīya* and *Kauṣitakī Upaniṣads* are in prose. The *Kaṭha*, *Iśa*, *Śvetāṣvatara*, *Muṇḍaka* and *Mahānārāyaṇīya Upaniṣads* are in verse. The *Kena* and *Praśna Upaniṣads* are partly in verse and partly in prose.

On the evidence of language and contents, it is held that the *Praśna*, *Maitrāyaṇīya* and *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣads* are of later origin and the *Aitareya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Taittirīya*, *Kauṣītakī* and *Kena Upaniṣads* represent the earliest stage.

Besides these fourteen, there is a large number of other *Upaniṣads*. Some of them are very old and many of very late origin. The leading exponents of the *Vedānta* schools have selected a few from among these to comment on them or to cite lines from them. Many of these are characterised by the religious spirit and have very little of philosophical matter. Including the above mentioned fourteen principal *Upaniṣads*, it is held that there are one hundred and eight *Upaniṣads*. As regards the subject matter, they could be classified into six groups viz., (1) based on the *Vedānta* doctrine : 24, (2) based on *Yoga* : 20, (3) *Saṁnyāsa* : 17, (4) *Vaiṣṇava* : 14, (5) *Śaiva* : 15 and (6) *Śākta* and miscellaneous : 18. The reason for the rise of so many minor *Upaniṣads* of varied contents must be found in the attempt of the followers of various religions and persuasions to have *Upaniṣads* representing their views.

The special feature of the *Upaniṣads* is that most of them are connected with one *Veda* or other. Many of them have nothing to do with the *Veda* to which they are attached. The attempt to connect all the *Upaniṣads* with the *Vedas* resulted in the attribution of ten *Upaniṣads* to the *Ṛgveda*, nineteen to the *Śuklayajus*, thirty-two to the *Kṛṣṇayajus*, sixteen to the *Sāma* and thirty-one to the *Atharva*.

A study of the contents of the *Upaniṣads* shows that for a few traces of their being connected with a particular *Veda*, there is nothing peculiar in their method of treatment or subject of treatment as to make the followers of one Vedic school treat the various doctrines which they preach as belonging to one particular Vedic school and therefore purposeless for the followers of other schools. In fact, what they contain is treated as common to the followers of all Vedic schools. The different schools of the *Vedānta* system look upon these *Upaniṣads* as authoritative texts supporting their doctrines. Thus the *Jñānakāṇḍa* of the *Vedas*, unlike the *Karmakāṇḍa*, is not only the source from which the followers of the different systems of thought derive information in support of their views but the one common authoritative text for all of them a reference to which cannot be denied by one school of thought to another. It is these *Upaniṣads* that have served as the strong foundations for the erection of the manifold structures of the systems of philosophy.

CHAPTER VII

VEDAṆGAS

The study of the *Vedas*, the proper understanding and interpretation of them and the application of their principles while performing the sacred rites necessitated the rise of the supplements of the *Vedas* known as *Vedāṅgas*. They are six in number viz., *Śikṣā* phonetics, *Vyākaraṇa* grammar, *Chandas* prosody, *Nirukta* etymological interpretation, *Jyotiṣa* astronomy and *Kalpa* ritualistic texts.

Vide :—शिक्षा व्याकरणं छन्दो निरुक्तं ज्योतिषं तथा ।
कल्पश्चेति षडङ्गानि वेदस्याहुर्मनीषिणः ।।

These are not the names of any works but are the names of the six subjects of study useful for the understanding of the Vedic tradition and practising it. *Śikṣā* and *Chandas* are aids for the reading and recitation of the *Vedas*, *Vyākaraṇa* and *Nirukta* for their understanding and *Jyotiṣa* and *Kalpa* for practising the rites enjoined in the Vedic texts. The origin of many of these can be traced to the Vedic texts themselves to the *Brāhmaṇas* in particular.

Śikṣā is closely connected with the *Saṁhitā* of the *Vedas*. It gives instructions for the correct pronunciation and accentuation of the *Saṁhitās* of the *Vedas*. This is dealt with in the works called *Prātiśākhyas* which, as their name implies, were each connected with a particular recension of the *Veda*. They are written in the form of aphorisms (*sūtras*). To the *Ṛgveda* is attached the *Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya* of *Śaunaka* in the *Śākala* recension, to the *Śuklayajurveda* of *Mādhyandina* recension is attached *Kātyāyana's Vājasaneyīprātiśākhyasūtra*, to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* is attached the *Taittirīyaprātiśākhyasūtra*, to the *Sāmveda* are attached the *Sāmaprātiśākhya*, *Puṣpasūtra* and *Pañcavidhasūtra* and to the *Atharvaveda* is attached the *Atharvavedaprātiśākhyasūtra* also called *Cāturadhyāyikā*. The authors of some of these texts are not known. These *Prātiśākhyas* reveal the accurate knowledge which the Vedic scholars possessed about the place and production of sound. These texts should have influenced the growth and development of grammatical studies. There are some texts allied to this *Vedāṅga* under the names *Pāṇiniśikṣā*, *Nāradaśikṣā*, *Vyāsaśikṣā* and others. Some are associated with the names of Bharadvāja, Yājñavalkya, Vasiṣṭha and others.

Vyākaraṇa is a supplement of the *Vedas* helpful for the proper understanding of the use of the words in their proper senses. Patañjali shows the need for the study of grammar by interpreting the passage रक्षोहागमलघ्वसंदेहाः प्रयोजनम् of Vararuci's *Vārtika* on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with appropriate illustrations.[1] Regarding the mode of formation of words, definite and diametrically opposite views were held by the grammarians in the early days of the development of grammar. According to Śākaṭāyana, the nouns were derived from the verbs. Gārgya and others denied its applicability to all nouns. The earliest text on grammar now available is the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. Pāṇini mentions Śākaṭāyana[2], Senaka[3] Śākalya[4] and others as his predecessors. The results achieved by the Indian grammarians are profound. "The Sanskrit grammarians of India were the first to analyse word forms, to recognise the difference between the root and suffix, to determine the function of suffixes, and on the whole to elaborate a grammatical system so accurate and complete as to be unparalleled in any other country."[5]

Chandas deals with the metres and their rules applicable to those in which the Vedic hymns are composed. The *Nidānasūtras* in ten sections explain the nature and names of Vedic metres and contain an index to the metres of the Vedic hymns.

Nirukta represents the early attempts at the interpretation of the *Vedas*. The earliest known text representing this attempt is the *Nirukta* of Yāska who lived before 800 B.C. Seventeen predecessors were there before Yāska in the field. Śākapūṇi is known to have been one among them. The words occurring in the *Vedas* were selected for interpretation and were grouped under three heads, viz., *Naighaṇṭukakāṇḍa* containing synonyms, *Naigamakāṇḍa* also called *Aikapadika* containing a list of ambiguous and difficult words and *Daivatakāṇḍa* containing a list of the names of deities occupying the sky, earth and heaven. A list of words called *Nirukta* was available to Yāska who wrote on it a commentary called also *Nirukta*.

Jyotiṣa arose as a supplement to serve the urgent needs of the sacrificers. The movements of the sun, moon and other planets and of the constellations are to be noticed for fixing the suitable days and periods for performing the sacrifices. It appears that lunar calculations were given more importance. References are found in the the standard treatises to the lunar and solar astronomical calculations and to the intercalary month. A work called *Jyotiṣavedāṅga* of unknown authorship contains 43 verses attached to the *Yajurveda* and 36 verses to the *Ṛgveda*.

The origin of *Kalpa* is to be traced to the *Brāhmaṇa* portion of the *Vedas*. The term *kalpa* means the performance of the sacrifices are determined through this.

Vide :—कल्प्यते समर्थ्यते यागप्रयोगोऽत्र इति व्युत्पत्तः ।

Sāyaṇa's Introduction to his
Ṛgvedabhāṣya

---

[1] *Mahābhāṣya* 1.1.1
[2] *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 8-4-50
[3] *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5-4-112
[4] *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 8-4-51
[5] A. A. Macdonell : India' Past. P. 136

The treatises dealing with this subject are in the form of *sūtras*, epigrammatic in form and understandable only with the aid of explanations. The long and tedious explanations, contained in the *Brāhmaṇas*, could not be remembered at the time of the performance of the sacred rites. Hence the *sūtra* form was adopted for treating this subject.

This subject is broadly classified under four heads viz., *Śrauta*, *Gṛhya*, *Dharma* and *Sulva*. The *Śrautasūtras* deal with the worship of the three fires *dakṣiṇa*, *āhavanīya* and *gārhapatya*, the performance of *darśapūrṇamāsa*, *soma* and other rites. The *Gṛhyasūtras* deal with all the popular customs and usages concerning a person from the time he is conceived in the womb of the mother till the hour of death. The major rites include the ceremonies connected with the birth of the child, initiation in the Vedic study (*upanayana*), the mode of life and duties of the members of the three castes Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya, in the two stages of the student of the *Vedas* and of the householder, the duties of a teacher, of a pupil, the marriage-customs, the five-sacrifices to be performed every day,[1] house-building, cattle-breeding, magic-rites to ward off diseases, funeral ceremonies and so on. In other words, these *sūtras* deal with all those rites connected with the life of a householder and which are to be performed by himself. The *Dharmasūtras* deal with law, religion, custom and usage, and the duties of castes and of the orders in life. The *Sulvasūtras* contain the rules for measuring and building the sacred altar. These represent the beginnings of Indian geometry.

The *Śrauta* and *Gṛhyasūtras* contain the rules for the conduct of the rituals and also for the use (*viniyoga*) of the prayers and formulas in the performance of the sacred rites. Each *Kalpasūtra* is attached to one *Veda* or the other. The *Mantrabrāhmaṇa* and the *Mantrapāṭha* are the two works containing the collections of the *mantras* specially made as a supplement to the *Kalpasūtras* and to be used for definite purposes by the followers of the *Gobhilagṛhyasūtras* and *Āpastambagṛhyasūtras* respectively.

Bodhāyana and Āpastamba, both of whom lived before 500 B. C., are the authors of the *Kalpasūtras* in their tradition attached to the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The *Gṛhya* and *Śrautasūtras* of *Satyāṣāḍha Hiraṇyakeśin* belong to an offshoot of the *Taittirīya* recension. The *Dharmasūtras* of this author do not materially differ from those of Āpastamba. The *Agniveśagṛhyasūtras* and the *Kalpasūtras* of the *Vādhūlas* and *Vaikhānasas* are also attached to the *Taittirīya* recension. The *Mānava* school of the *Maitrāyaṇīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* has the *Śrauta*, *Gṛhya* and *Sulvasūtras*. To the same school are attached the *Kāṭhakagṛhyasūtras*. The *Kalpasūtras* of Bharadvāja are also attached to the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*.

---

[1] These are *brahmayajña*, teaching and studying the *Vedas*, *pitṛyajña*, offering libations of water to the manes, *daivayajña* offering oblations to the gods, *bhūtayajña*, giving oblations to all created beings, and *nṛyajña*, hospitality to the guests.

Vide :—अध्यापनं ब्रह्मयज्ञः पितृयज्ञस्तु तर्पणम् ।
होमो दैवो वलिर्भौतो नृयज्ञोऽतिथिपूजनम् ।।

Manusmṛti III-70

The *Ṛgveda* has the *Gṛhya* and *Śrautsūtras* of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhyāyana and the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Śāmbhavya and Śaunaka. The *Śuklayajurveda* has the *Śrauta* and *Sulvasūtras* of Kātyāyana and the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Pāraskara are attached to the *Mādhyandina* recension. The *Sāmaveda* has the *Śrautasūtras* of Kātyāyana for the *Kauthuma* recension and the *Śrautasūtras* of Drāhyāyaṇa for the *Rāṇāyanīya* recension both being based on the *Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa*, the *Gṛhya* and *Śrautasūtras* of Jaimini, the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Gobhila and the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Khādira for the *Drāhyāyaṇa* recension also used for the *Rāṇāyanīya* recension. In addition to these, attached to this *Veda*, are the *Ārṣeyakalpa* also known as the *Maśakakalpasūtras* containing an index of the hymns to be sung at the *Soma* sacrifice by the followers of the *Tāṇḍya* recension, the *Anupadasūtras* a comment on the *Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa*, the *Nidānsūtras* on metres, the *Upagranthasūtras* on the performance of the sacrifices attached to the *Sāmaveda*, the *Taṇḍalakṣaṇasūtras*, the *Kalpānupada*, the *Anustotrasūtras* and the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Drāhyāyaṇa. The *Atharvaveda* has the *Vaitānaśrautasūtras* and the *Kauśikasūtras* which treat the matter coming under *Gṛhya* and also magic. Since this *Veda* has no direct connection with the performance of the sacrifices, it does not have other divisions of the *Kalpasūtras*.

The *Gṛhyasūtras* are followed by the *Śrāddhakalpas* and *Pitṛmedhasūtras* containing the rules for the rites connected with the manes. The *Mānavaśrāddhakalpa*, *Kātyāyanaśrāddhakalpa*, *Bodhāyanapitṛmedhasūtras* and others come under this head. The *Pariśiṣṭas* or addenda contain a more detailed treatment of certain topics of the rituals dealt with briefly in the *Kalpasūtras*. The *Chāndogya* and the *Atharvapariśiṣṭa* of Kātyāyana, the *Kratusaṅgraha*, the *Viniyogasaṅgraha* and the *Caraṇavyūha* containing an exposition of the Vedic schools its authorship being ascribed to Śaunaka come under this head. The *Gṛhyasaṅgrahapariśiṣṭa* of Gobhilaputra and the *Karmapradīpa* are attached to the *Gobhilagṛhyasūtras*. The *Prāyaścittasūtras* form part of the *Vaitānasūtras* of the *Atharvaveda*. The *Prayogas* which are practical handbooks, the *Paddhatis* which are outlines and the *Kārikās* which are versified representations form part of the *Kālpasūtras*.

The importance attached to these supplements is well brought out in the following stanza :—

छन्दः पादौ तु वेदस्य हस्तौ कल्पोऽय पठ्यते ।
ज्योतिषामयनं चक्षुर्निरुक्तं श्रोत्रमुच्यते ॥
शिक्षा घ्राणं तु वेदस्य मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।
तस्मात्सांङ्गमधीत्यैव ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥

Pāṇinīyaśikṣā 41-42

Apart from these supplements, there are indexes called *Anukramaṇīs*. These contain the lists of the contents of the Vedic *Saṁhitās* with reference to the sages to whom the hymns are ascribed, the deities praised in the hymns, and the metres in which the hymns are composed. For the *Ṛgveda*, Śaunaka wrote the *Ārṣānukramaṇī* a list of the sages, *Chandonukramaṇī* a list of the metres, *Devatānukramaṇī* a list of the deities, *Sūktānukramaṇī* a list of the hymns, *Padānukramaṇī* a list of words, *Anuvākānukramaṇī* that of the chapters, *Bṛhaddevatā* that of the gods together with the allusions connected with them and *Ṛgvidhāna* a list giving an account of the magic effects that could be obtained by the recitation of the particular hymns. From these indexes, the *Ṛgveda* is known to contain 1017 hymns, 10580½ verses, 153826 words and 432000 syllables. The Western scholars hold that some among these were not written by Śaunaka. *Kātyā*yana, a pupil of Śaunaka, wrote the *Sarvānukramaṇī* an index of all these in the form of aphorisms. This index belongs to the *Ṛgveda*. To the same anthor is ascribed the authorship of the *Yajurvedānukramaṇī* of the *Vājasaneyīsaṁhitā* of the *Mādhyandina* recension. The *Ātreyaśikṣā* and *Cārāyaṇīya* also called *Mantrarahasyādhyāya* belong to the *Taittirīya* recension of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. The *Ātreyaśikṣā* contains an index to the *Saṁhitā*, *Brāhmaṇa* and *Āraṇyaka* portions. The *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* in spite of its title, is only an index to the *Sāmaveda*. The *Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī* is the index to the *Atharvavedasaṁhitā*. Besides these, there are suppelmentary treatises called *Pariśiṣṭas* twenty in number. All of them belong to the *Sāmaveda*.

Like the six supplements, the *Purāṇas*, *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṁsā* and *Dharmaśāstras* are considered to be helpful for understanding the spirit of the Vedic passages.

Vide :—पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ।।

Yājñavalkyasmṛti I. 3.

CHAPTER VIII

EPICS—RĀMĀYAṆA

The *Saṁskṛta* equivalent for the English word epic is *itihāsa.* The derivation of the word *itihāsa* is given thus :—

इति हेत्यव्ययं पारम्पर्योपदेशाभिधायि ।

तस्यासनं आसः अवस्थानमेतेष्विति इतिहासाः पुरावृत्तानि ।

The word '*itiāhsa*' means ancient occurrences handed down traditionally from one generation to another. It is defined as containing the stories of ancient occurrences and as containing instructions about the four-fold pursuits of existence viz., *dharma, artha, kāma* and *mokṣa.*

Vide :—धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणामुपदेशसमन्वितम् ।

पूर्ववृत्तकथायुक्तमितिहासं प्रचक्षते ॥

Itihāsas therefore are accounts of ancient occurrences (पुरावृत्त) and so could not be treated as myths or fictitious as the scholars of the West have chosen to treat them.

Indian tradition treats the *Vedas* as eternally existent or at any rate revealed by God at the time of creation. The Vedic sages should have composed then certain narratives to support Vedic interpretations. These came to be called *Itihāsa*, *Ākhyāna* and *Upākhyāna*. There must have been a large number of them each called by one or the other name. Most of them got included in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata* and *Purāṇas.* After this stage, the *Rāmāyṇa* and *Mahābhārata* came to be styled as the *Itihāsas.* These two epics refer to a number of *Itihāsas.*[1] Hence the epic period must be taken to have been in existence from very early times.

The language of the epics betrays many of the features of the Vedic *Saṁskṛta* and the *bhāṣā.* The literature of the epics arose in a religious atmosphere. As evidenced by the *Brāhmaṇas*, these were recited at the time of the performance of the sacrifices. One notable feature of the *Itihāsas* is that the Vedic deities Savitṛ, Agni, Indra and others came to be treated with less importance. Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra are given prominence. Kubera, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, Lakṣmī, Pārvatī, serpent-deities and others, who did not get prominent treatment in the *Vedas*, begin to occupy an eminent position. The *Ṛgveda* is in the form of verse, while the other *Vedas*, *Brāhmaṇas* and others are in the form of prose. The *Itihāsas* are mostly written in verse form, some among those included in the *Mahābhārata* having been composed in prose. The Western scholars point out that the spirit of optimism pervaded the earlier compostions of the *Ṛgveda* while the epic literature betrays the sufferings in life and thus a pessimistic tone in a restricted sense. This however does not appear to be true. The spirit of optimism has been there through all the periods, epic and classical but in the *Itihāsas*, there is the reference to the sufferings of the individuals but these sufferings are shown to have been patiently borne in a spirit of optimism.

---

[1] Cf. Rāmāyaṇa VI-120-32
Mahābhārata- *Udyoga* 36, 133
Droṇa 52
Śānti 103, 104, 111
Anuśāsana 50

RĀMĀYANA

The *Rāmāyaṇa* is one of the two outstanding Indian epics, the other one being the *Mahābhārata*. It contains 24000 *ślokas* distributed among seven *kāṇḍas*. It was composed by Vālmīki. It deals with the life of Rāma and Sītā. The author calls it a poem[1], *ākhyāna*[2], *gītā*[3], and *saṁhitā*.[4]

Vālmīki was the tenth son of Varuṇa. He fell into evil company and joined a band of robbers. By chance, he realised his folly and was initiated into religious life by the seven sages. He sat in deep meditation for days together. When he got up from his penance, he had to come out of an anthill which grew up around and on him. Hence he came to be called Vālmīki which name means one who had come out of the anthill (*valmīka*). He took up his residence near the Citrakuṭa. Once he happened to meet the divine sage Nārada and desired to know from him about the life of an ideal man possessing all inestimable qualities. Sage Nārada told him that Rāma was such a person. Then Vālmīki proceeded to the river Tamasā for ablition. On the way, he noticed a hunter strike a male Krauñca bird which fell down dead leaving its mate cry bitterly at this separation. Vālmīki was overwhelmed with grief at this sight and pronounced a curse upon the hunter. This took the form of a *śloka* which is as follows :—

मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वमगमः शाश्वतीः समाः ।
यत्क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम् ॥

Rāmāyaṇa 1-2-15

After this, he took his bath in the river and returned to his hermitage. Brahmā appeared before him and directed him to compose a work on the life of Rāma. He bestowed on Vālmīki the power to have direct communion with Rāma's life, not only of the past but also of the future. Accordingly the sage composed the poem which came to be called Rāmāyaṇa. He taught the poem to Kuśa and Lava, sons of Sītā who was then exiled by Rāma and was living in his hermitage. The poem was sung by the two boys in the presence of Rāma when the latter performed Aśvamedha. The poem is contained in seven Kāṇḍas known under the names *Bāla, Ayodhyā, Araṇya, Kiṣkindhā, Sundara, Yuddha and Uttara.*

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa* I- 2-41; VI-128-105
[2] *Rāmāyaṇa* I- 4-32; VI-128-118
[3] „ I- 4-27
[4] „ VI 128-120

The scholars of the West and some Indian scholars in their following are of opinion that Vālmīki wrote from the latter half of the *Bālakāṇḍa* upto the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa.* The remaining parts of the epic were composed by some later writers. Their arguments in support of this conclusion are as follow. The *Bālakāṇḍa* contains two tables of contents, one in the form of the *Saṁkṣeparāmāyaṇa* which is Nārada's version of Rāma's life and the other which is given in the third canto of the *Bālakāṇḍa.* While the former does not refer to the contents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, the latter refers to them. The latter must have been prepared by a later writer for the whole *Rāmāyaṇa* when it was made available. Vālmīki must have written up to the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* only following the information furnished to him by Nārada. The benedictory stanzas at the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* support this. Secondly, the *Bālakāṇḍa* contains a number of anecdotes *e.g.*, those relating to Ṛsyaśṛṅga, Viṣvāmitra, Ahalyā, Gaṅgā's descent and so on. The Uttarakāṇḍa contains even a larger number of anecdotes such as those relating to Rāvaṇa, Hanumān, Nimi, Vṛtra and others. Curiously enough, the other *Kāṇḍas* do not contain any such anecdote. Vālmīki must have therefore written the latter part of the *Bālakāṇḍa* and following it the five *Kāṇḍas* where there is no inclusion of any ancedote.

The possible motives for the addition of portions both at the begining and end of the epic may be classified into three groups. 1. After the *Mahābhārata* became famous as an epic with a number of anecdotes included therein, the desire of some admirers of the *Rāmāyaṇa* must have made them incorporate a number of anecdotes in the *Bālakāṇḍa* and frame a separate *Kāṇḍa* viz., *Uttarakāṇḍa* containig the biographical accounts of the characters of the epic. 2. Vālmīki treated Rāma as a man. After Kṛṣṇa became deified, the admirers of Rāma glorified him and introduced in the *Bālakṇḍa, Uttarakāṇḍa* and also in the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, passages deifying Rāma. 3. Vālmīki uttered the curse on the hunter which took the form of a metrical composition in the *kaŚlo* metre. At the bidding of Brahmā, Vālmīki should have composed his epic in stanzas of *Śloka* metre. Later, the epic was sought to be made an ideal *Mahākāvya.* This required addition of *ślokas* at the end of each canto in different metres. Thus more stanzas came to be added to the original composed by Vālmīki.

The arguments given above do not stand to reason, when the circumstances that led Vālmīki to write the epic are taken up for consideration. Vālmīki was no stranger to Rāma and Sītā. It is his hermitage which Rāma visited first on his exile from Ayodhyā.[1] It is this acquaintance that made Rāma order Lakṣmaṇa for abandoning Sītā near Vālmīki's hermitage.[2] It is Vālmīki that gave protection to Sītā[1] and brought up her two sons Kuśa and Lava and gave them education. His heart, which was overwhelmed by grief at the sight of the female bird shrieking at the separation of its mate, must have been moved very much at the plight of the exiled queen of Ayodhyā taking shetter under him. It is in this contesxt, he must have put his question to Nārada and after this, he composed the whole epic in 24000 stanzas in 500 cantos grouped in seven *kāṇḍas.*[2] While he was just trying to choose the appropriate person for teaching the epic, the twin sons of Sītā bowed to him. He taught them the epic. The two boys were already trained by him in singing.

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa* II -56

[2] *Rāmāyaṇa* VII-55-17-18

From this, it is clear that Vālmīki was not unaware of Rāma's greatness before he met Nārada. It is the scandal raised by the people of Ayodhyā that compelled him put the greatness of Sītā in writing. Hence Sītā's name was also associated with the epic which he composed.

काव्यं रामायणं कृत्स्नं सीतायाश्चरितं महत् ।
पौलस्त्यवधमित्येव चकार चरितव्रतः ॥

Rāmāyaṇa—Bālakāṇḍa 4—7

The *Saṁkṣeparāmāyaṇa* contains an account of Rāma's life as Nārada narrated. The third canto of the *Bālakāṇḍa* gives the contents of what Vālmīki wrote. It is clearly stated that Vālmīki wrote not only about the past happenings but also about the future.[3] There is no evidence to prove that Vālmīki did not write beyond the version given by Nārada. Besides, Nārada's version contains references to the incidents of the *Uttarakāṇḍa.*[4] It is said that Vālmīki wrote the six *kāṇḍas* and the seventh one also.[5] The presence of the benedictory stanzas at the end of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* is to be justified on the ground that they are there on the auspicious occasion of Rāma's coronation and that those who take to daily recitation of the epic would stop with the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* and would not recite the *Uttarkāṇḍa* which does not have a prosperous ending understood in the worldly sense.

Regarding the anecdotes in the *Bālakāṇḍa* and in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, a careful study of the epic shows that all the anecdotes fit in the context and are there to serve a definite purpose. That some among them are spurious is admitted by the Indian commentators.[6] These appear in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. Hence it cannot be held that such stories came to be interpolated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Whether Vālmīki considered Rāma as a man or God cannot be answered definitly at this stage. That Rāma was God incarnate is clear from several contexts.[7] This question may be left to the readers for decision, as the references cited here

---

1. *Rāmāyaṇa* VII-59 2. *Rāmāyaṇa* I -4-2. 3. *Rāmāyaṇa* I-4-3.
4. „ I-1-94-97 5. „ I-4-2
6. *Rāmāyaṇa*-VII 13 cantos according to the commentator Tilaka
7. *Rāmāyaṇa* VII-117-11; 117 & 119 ; 111

in support of Rāma's divinity are considered as interpolations by the critical scholars. That Vālmīki could not have composed stanzas in any metre other than *Śloka* cannot be proved. In the Sanskrit language, the word *śloka*[1] means what is put together and does not convey the sense of the *Śloka* metre. If Vālmīki is denied the authorship of the stanzas in other metres, some of the enchanting descriptions[2] in the *Kiṣkindhā* and *Sundarakāṇḍas* would affect Vālmīki's eminence adversely. Even if it is held that Vālmīki wrote only in *śloka* metre, the epic which he composed appears to have undergone no substantial change, for there are many cantos which do not end in different metres.[3] Hence it has to be admitted that Vālmīki wrote the entire epic.

That Vālmīki wrote the *Uttarakāṇḍa* is maintainable on the following grounds. The *Mahābārata* contains frequent references to the contents of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. These references are made with a specific purpose and so do not contain the full version of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Some[4] among them refer to the incidents narrated in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, while others[5] do not refer to them. In his encounter with Hanumān, Bhīmasena is informed by the latter about the greatness of Rāma. In this connection, Hanumān speaks of Rāma as the incarnation of Viṣṇu.

Vide :—विष्णुर्मानुषरूपेण चचार वसुधातलम् ।

Mahābhārata—Vana 149-31

There are also references to Rāma's divinity in the other parts of the *Mahābhārata*.[6] The story of Rāma is narrated to Yudhiṣṭhira by Mārkaṇḍeya in chapters 275-293 of the *Vanaparva*. In chapter 277, Mārkaṇḍeya himself refers to Rāma's divinity. This cannot be treated as interpolation, as this narration is predicted in the *Bhāgavata*.

Vide :—रामवीर्यं श्रोष्यसि त्वं मार्कण्डेयमुखात्प्रभो ।

Bhāgavata VII. 1. 44

All these show that according to Vyāsa and Vaiśampāyana, the *Rāmāyaṇa* included the *Uttarakāṇḍa* and Rāma was considered an incarnation of God. Besides, in the absence of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, Bharata and Śatrughna would not be known to have distinguished themselves in battles and the greatness of Rāvaṇa and Hanumān would have remained unknown. Vālmīki too would have been then acccused of having been partial to Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. There is an authentic evidence for Vālmīki having written the *Uttarakāṇḍa* and it comes from the pen of the great philosopher-rhetorician Ānandavardhana.

---

[1] श्लोकृ संघाते ; पद्ये यशसि च श्लोकः । I Amarasiṁha : *Nāmaliṅgānusāsana* III. 2

[2] *Rāmāyana* V 24, 28, 30, VI 5, 7, 8

[3] Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa* I-13, 44, II 29, 30, 118, III 15, 19, IV 19, 36, V 11, 12, 18, VI 4, 17, 30, VII 16, 17, 18.

[4] *Mahābhārata-Sabhā*-50; *Droṇa* 59

[5] „ *Vana*-275-293.

[6] „ *Sabhā*-50; *Vana* 98, 277. *Śānti* 206-54

Vide :—रामायणे हि करुणो रसः स्वयमादिकविना सूचितः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः इत्येवंवादिना । निर्व्यूढश्च स एव सीतात्यन्तवियोगपर्यन्तमेव स्वप्रबन्धमुपरचयता ।

Dhvanyāloka. Ch. IV

Diññāga, the author of the *Kundamālā*, makes a reference to Vālmīki having written his epic upto the final desertion of *Sītā*.[1]

There is however a discrepancy regarding the passage which runs thus :—

चतुर्विंशत्सहस्राणि श्लोकानामुक्तवानृषिः ।
तथा सर्गशतान् पञ्च षट् काण्डानि तथोत्तरम् ॥

Rāmāyaṇa I-4-2

Here it is mentioned that the author Vālmīki composed his *Rāmāyaṇa* in seven *Kāṇḍas*. It contained 24000 *ślokas* and 500 cantos. The present editions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* contain about 645 cantos and a little more than 24000 *ślokas*. The cantos originally written by Vālmīki must have been very long and could have been split up into shorter cantos.[2] Some among them might have been lost and some were added to make up the loss. Some *ślokas* must have been lost, misplaced or added.[3] This is evident from the discrepancies in the number of cantos and *ślokas* found in the Northern, North-Western and Bombay recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. There are however some cases which shall be treated as interpolations. The references to some civilised countries,[4] to the teachings of Buddha[5] and Hanuman's study[6] could be held to point out to this. Taking into account the oral tradition through which the epic was handed down, such interpolations like these are inevitable in a work like the *Rāmāyaṇa* composed several thousands of years ago. Making allowances for these losses and additions of passages, it must be admitted that Vālmīki composed the whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The scholars of the West sought to characterise the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as a fiction. Their contention for this has been that the characters of the epic are unreal, as they could not be believed to have had real existence and that the feats described to have been practised by them are equally unreal. Hence they treated the theme in this epic as mythological and began to formulate various theories for the rise of such a theme.

---

1. *Kundamālā* of Diññāga VI. 14
2.cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*-VI 53, 54; 55, 56; 66, 67; and others in the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*.
3. Rama is said to have uttered the following *śloka* to Sitā :—

त्वदर्थमिव विन्यस्तः शिलापट्टोऽयमग्रतः ।
यस्यायमभितः पुष्पैः प्रवृष्ट इव केसरः ॥ *Uttararāmacarita VI* 36.

This occurs in a slightly different form in a canto considered by Tilaka as interpolated and included between cantos 95 and 96 in *Ayodhva* kāṇda of the Bombay Edition.

4. *Rāmāyaṇa* IV-41 5. *Rāmāyaṇa* II-109. 6. *Rāmāyaṇa* VII-36

Prof. Weber was of opinion that the *Rāmāyaṇa* must have been based on the *Daśarathajātaka* and Homer's Iliad. He little realised the chronological difficulties that would rise on the acceptance of this theory. Both these works are of late origin. The *Daśarathajātaka* is a Buddhist version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* composed for the specific purpose of offering consolation to a son grieving at the death of his father. Prof. Jacobi put forward a strange theory making the Vṛtra incident found in the *Ṛgveda* the basis of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Vṛtra, a demon and enemy of Indra, stole away the cows of [illegible] Indra and hid them beyond the seas. Saramā, a dog sent by Indra, [illegible] brought information about the whereabouts of the cows by crossing the seas. Aided by the wind-deities, Indra attacked Vṛtra and slew him. In the epic, the names Indrajit, a foe of Rāma, Sītā the furrowed land, Hanumān searching for Sītā and Hanumān described as the son of Vāyu are made use of by Prof. Jacobi in support of his theory. There is in fact coincidence here but it is only accidental. Rāvaṇa was the foe of Rāma by carrying away Sītā. Indrajit was not directly connected with it. Hanumān was the only monkey who was the son of Vāyu. It is absurd to treat all the monkeys who helped Rāma as having connection with Hanumān. The incidents narrated in the *Ṛgveda* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* have to be treated as distinct from each other and as real, for any theory based on such accidental similarities would, if pressed, declare any real occurrence as fictitious.

The very terms *itihāsa*[1] and *purāvṛtta*[2] as applied to the *Rāmāyaṇa* show that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is based on an ancient actual occurrence. Neither the events that are described in the court of Ayodhyā nor the results of them have any tinge of unreality attached to them. They have to be admitted as normal occurrences. The physical formations of Rāvaṇa, Triśiras and others represent the freaks of nature and are not stated to be in common with those of other demons. Therefore unreality cannot be attached to any of these.

Anachronistic are the views of Talboys Wheeler who suggested that the epic was only a poetic rendering of the conflict between Brahminism and Buddhism in South India and that the epic was based on the conquest of South India in the 13th century A.D. by the founders of the Vijayanagar empire. Three theories were put forward in order to show that the Āryans dominated the southern part of India and that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was written for this purpose. Among these, the first one, formulated by Lassen, referred to the epic as the allegorical representation of the Āryan conquest over the South. The second one makes the epic as representing the Āryan plough husbandry progressing among the mountains and the forests of central and Southern India and the perils of the agricultural settlers from non-ploughing nomadic hunting tribes. Prof Weber, who put forward the third theory, treated the epic as the allegorical representation of the spread of Āryan civilisation towards the south, more especially

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa*- VI-128-120

[2] *Rāmāyaṇa*- VI-128-118

डा. डिल्ली रमण रेग्मी
कल्याणी रेग्मी स्मारक
पुस्तकालय
5257

to Ceylon'.[1] All these theories are baseless, as Rāma's march to the South did not result in finding a realm by conquering any one there nor are Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa described to have gone to the South as agricultural settlers nor is it shown anywhere that Rāma's march to the South and to Ceylon produced any change in the civilisation of the peoples there.

According to the Indian tradition, Rāma lived at the end of the *Tretāyuga* which came to an end 867100 years before the birth of Christ. Vālmīki was a contemporary of Rāma and wrote his epic while Rāma was ruling in Ayodhyā. Rāma himself listened to the recitation of this epic. Hence the date of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is about 867000 B.C. This date is fantastic, absurd and unacceptable to the Western shcolars and the Indian scholars in their line of thinking. The results of archaeological excavations and of scientific discoveries would prove and fix this as the approximate date of this epic but this will happen not in the near future.

The scholars of the West have sought to prove that the nucleus of the epic was available in a definite form before 500 B.C. on the following grounds :— 1. The *Mahābhārata*, which took a definite shape about the beginning of the Christian era, contains references to the contents of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its author. 2. Patna, which was founded by Kālāśoka who presided over the second Buddhist council at Vaiśāli in 380 B.C., is not mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while many towns, like Kauśāmbī, Kānyakubja, Kāmpilya and others lying to the east of Ayodhyā, are mentioned. 3. Mithilā and Viśālā which are mentioned as independent principalities in the epic, became grouped together under the name Vaiśālī which was ruled by oligarchy during the days of the Buddha. 4. Sāketa came to denote Ayodhyā during the days of Buddhism. This is not referred to in the nuclear portion of the epic. Likewise, Śrāvastī, which became the capital of Lava, the son of Rāma and which became the capital after the rise of Buddhism, is not mentioned in the original portion of the epic. 5. The kings during the days of the *Mahābhārata* had control over complex states while those in the days of the *Rāmāyaṇa* controlled small states. Therefore 'the original part of the *Rāmāyaṇa* assumed shape at a time when the *Mahābhārata* was still in a state of flux.'[2]

It has been already shown that Vālmīki himself wrote the entire *Rāmāyaṇa*. Therefore the question of the epic-kernel or later additions does not rise. The *Mahābhārata* refers to the central theme of the Rāmāyaṇa. The *Mahābhārata* was available in full at the beginning of the *Kaliyuga*. Regarding the other grounds on which the date of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is sought to be fixed, it is better to treat such references as are mentioned there as interpolations.

---

[1] Weber : History of Indian Literature p. 192

[2] A. A. Macdonell : A History of Sanskrit Literature p.302

RAMAYANA AS AN EPIC

The *Rāmāyaṇa* has become a popular book at the hands of the people of India. "High and low, prince and peasant, nobleman, merchant and artisan, princesses and shpeherdesses, all are quite familiar with the characters and stories of the great epic."[1] Jawaharlal Nehru writes that the story of the epic is "a part of the texture of the lives of our people." "From the peasant in the field and the worker in the factory to the highbrow and the scholar, the story of Rāma and Sītā has been a living one."[2] It is the popular literary work and more than that, it is held in great veneration by the Hindus. The pious-minded make a daily recitation of it. It is not placed on the floor but is always placed on a plank. Since the writing of the epic, it has gained a fame which no other work has to its credit. Brahmā predicted that the story of Rāma would last as long as the mountains stand and the rivers flow.

Vide :—यावत्स्थास्यन्ति गिरयः सरितश्च महीतले ।
तावद्रामायणकथा लोकेषु प्रचरिष्यति ॥
Rāmāyaṇa—I-2-36 37.

The epic is called *Ādikāvya* and Vālmīki is called *Ādikavi*. The unique popularity is due to the characters of the epic, style, characterisation, description and innumerable memorable sayings which it contains. Luckily for Vālmīki, there was no difficulty in chosing the hero and heroine for his poem. The hero was a man of spotless character, of inestimable qualities and of great prowess. It is difficult to enumerate his qualities which endeared him to his subjects.[3] Suffice it to say that Sītā was a deserving wife to whom Rāma was a husband worthy of her.

राघवोऽर्हति वैदेहीं तं चेयमसितेक्षणा ।
Rāmāyaṇa *V*-16-5

Vālmīki himself feels that of all heroes, Rāma alone deserves a place in a poem.

न ह्यन्योऽर्हति काव्यानां यशोभाग्राघवादृते ।
Rāmāyaṇa *VII*-98-18.

The same may be said of the other characters in the epic.

The style of the poem is very simple, dignified, ornate and polished. The epic contains no word of rare occurrence. When recited, the language of the epic produces an enchanting impression on the hearers, the like of which is not available in the whole range of the *Saṁskṛta* literature. The epic is charming both when read and sung.[4] All the sentiments have their due place in it. It is embellished by the figures of speech like *Upamā*[5], *Svabhāvokti*[6] and *Rūpaka*[7] which are

---

1. M. Winternitz : A History of Indian Literature Vol. I 476-477
2. Preface to the *Rāmāyaṇa* by N. Chandrasekhara Iyer—Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay.
3. *Rāmāyaṇa* II-2 4. *Rāmāyaṇa* I-4-8 9. 5. *Rāmāyaṇa* V-17, 19, 21, 25.
6. *Rāmāyaṇa* IV-28. 7. *Rāmāyaṇa* V-21-27; 37-18

employed to perfection only by Vālmīkī. No *Saṁskṛta* poet had displayed his skill in *Śabdālaṅkāra* with effortless ease as Vālmīki had done.[1] The language has many archaic expressions. Enchanted by the language of the epic, Bhoja exclaimed

मधुमयफणितीनां मार्गदर्शी महर्षिः ।

Rāmāyaṇacampu I. 8

Vālmīki's remarkable keen insight into the workings of the human heart is revealed in the vivid portrayal of the characters in the various situations. The noble qualities of the four princes of Ayodhyā and of the daughter of Janaka do not need any mention here nor does the need arise in the case of the chief characters in Laṅkā and Kiṣkindhā. The poet draws, with admirable skill, the line of contrast in the mental attitudes of the three queens of Ayodhyā.

Unique is the power of Vālmīki in describing palaces,[2] city-life,[3] gardens,[4] hills,[5] rise of the moon,[6] rivers,[7] the seasons cold,[8] rainy,[9] and autumn,[10] forest-sites,[11] hemitages,[12] armies and battles,[13] and others. His description of nature has got a realistic touch not to be met with in the work of any other writer.

The epic contains many memorable sayings. They are characterised by didactic nature. They contain eternal truths. Some among them could be cited here.

भयं भीताद्धि जायते । *Rāmāyaṇa* II-8-5
ऋद्धियुक्ता हि पुरुषा न सहन्ते परस्तवम् ,, II-26-25
अनिर्वेदः श्रियो मूलं अनिर्वेदः परं सुखम् ।
अनिर्वेदो हि सततं सर्वार्थेषु प्रवर्तकः ।। ,, V-12-10
सुलभाः पुरुषा राजन् सततं प्रियवादिनः ।
अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य वक्ता श्रोता च दुर्लभः ।। ,, III-37-2
उत्साहवन्तः पुरुषा नावसीदन्ति कर्मसु । ,, IV-1-122

Many of these passages teach men the path of material and spiritual progress. The unabated desire for property and sex mars the life of the individual as evidenced by the careers of Kaikeyī and Vālin in the former case and by those of Rāvaṇa and Daśaratha in the latter.[1] The poet lays stress on purity of conduct which alone explains a man.

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa* V-5, 7
[2] ,, V-6, 9
[3] ,, I-5
[4] ,, V-14
[5] ,, II-94
[6] ,, V-5
[7] *Rāmāyaṇa* II-95; III 75
[8] ,, III-16
[9] ,, IV-28
[10] ,, IV-30
[11] ,, I-24
[12] ,, III-7, 11
[13] *Rāmāyaṇa* III-20-30; VI

Vide :—कुलीनमकुलीनं वा वीरं पुरुषमानिनम् ।
चारित्रमेव व्याख्याति शुचिं वा यदि वा शुचिम् ।।

Rāmāyaṇa II-109-4

Marriage is a sacred trust and its sanctity is very well brought out. Above all these, devotion to duty, in the light of these principles, elevates a person to glory.

The epic gives a vivid account of the state of society in ancient India. Democracy with the king at the head of the state was the system of government in Ayodhyā and Laṅkā.[2] The policies of the government depended on the will of the people. Steps were taken to prevent undue competition in trade and oppression of the weak by the mighty. There are references to engineering skill exhibited by the artisans. Machines were used for removing the trees and slabs.[3] The religious rites were practised by the people of Ayodhyā. The demons, who created obstacles to the performances of such rites, performed them to gain personal ends.[4] They practised Vedic recitation.[5] The standards of morality were very strict in Ayodhy*ā* and somewhat loose in Kiṣkindh*ā*. On specific occasions, the dead body was kept immersed in a cistern filled with oil to prevent it from decomposition.[6] There are references to surgical operations and some medical remedies.[7]

Condition of Nation during Epic period

The epic has profoundly influenced the life of the people and also the poets of the classical period. The incidents from the epic are recited for the purpose of illustrating the lessons in life. It has moulded the character of the nation. "A story and a book which has had this powerful influence on millions of people, during some millennia of our changing history must have peculiar virtue in it."[8] The word *rāmarājya* has come to mean benign rule. The story of Rāma has been attracting people even in the form of translations. Its popularity is very well seen in the large audience attending the discourses on the epic. About the beginning of the Christian era, the epic became popular in foreign lands like Siam, Java, Sumatra, Bali and others. Inscriptions in these lands speak of the arrangements made there for the daily recitation of the epic. In India, it has made a permanent impression on the classical literature. The poets of the classical period derived inspiration from the epic

---

1. *Rāmāyaṇa* II-53-13
2. *Rāmāyaṇa* II-1, 2; VI-6 to 16; Evils of anarchy were fully realised. II-67
3. *Rāmāyaṇa* VI-22-56
4. *Rāmāyaṇa* VI-85
5. „ V-18-2
6. „ II-66
7. „ V-28-6; VI-101-43
8. Jawaharlal Nehru : Preface to the *Rāmāyaṇa* by N. Chandrasekhara Iyer, Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay

and wrote their compostions, the themes having been chosen from the epic. It is available in the form of translations in many Indian languages. Popular among them are the *Rām Charit Mānas* written in Hindi by Tulsi Das in 1574 A.D. and the *Kamba Rāmāyaṇa* in Tamil by Kamban in the 13th century A.D.

commentaries on the epic

There are many commentaries on the epic. Most of them are of late origin. The important among them are the *Rāmāyaṇatattvadīpikā* of Maheśvaratīrtha, *Amṛtakataka* of Śrīrāma, *Dīpikā* of Vaidyanāthadīkśita, *Tilaka* of Rāma, *Bhūṣaṇa* of Govindarāja, *Vālmīkibhāvaprakāśikā* of Haripaṇḍita, and *Vālmīkihṛdaya* of Ahobala. An exposition of the importance of the epic was made by Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.) in his *Rāmāyaṇatātparyasaṅgraha* and by Tṛymbakamakhin (C. 1700 A.D.) in his *Dharmākūta*.

———

CHAPTER IX

MAHABHARATA

The *Mahābhārata* is the other well-known Itihāsa. It was composed by Vyāsa. It is the longest poem known to literary history. It contains one lakh of stanzas. Its size is eight times that of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* put together. It is divided into eighteen sections each being called *parvan*. The eighteen *parvans* are : *Ādi*, *Sabhā*, *Vana*, *Virāṭa*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, *Karṇa*, *Śalya*, *Sauptika*, *Strī*, *Śānti*, *Anuśāsana*, *Āśvamedhika*, *Āśramavāsika*, *Mausala*, *Mahāprasthānika* and *Svargārohaṇa*. Among these, the *Śāntiparvan* is the longest containing about 14700 stanzas and the last is the shortest wlth 200 stanzas. It has a supplement called *Harivaṁśa* containing about 12000 stanzas. Including the supplement, the epic contains one lakh of stanzas.

The epic deals with the story of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. The story is too well-known and needs no narration here. Besides this story, the epic contains the accounts about the activities of gods, kings and sages who are not directly connected with the theme of the epic. The epic contains also information on cosmogony, theogony, expositions on philosophy, law, religion, duties of the castes and orders in life. In its final shape, it is a compendium teaching the four-fold aims of human existence. On account of this, this epic came to be called the fifth *Veda*.

Vyāsa, who wrote the epic together with the *Harivaṁśa* was originally called Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana as he was born in an island and was black in complexion. He was the son of the sage Parāśara. He was responsible for the arrangement of the *Vedas* or classified them for the benefit of mankind.

Vide :—विव्यास बेदान् यस्मात्स तस्माद्व्यास इति स्मृतः ।

Mahābhārata- Ādi 64-130

He was a contemporary of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. He was an eye-witness to the incidents connected with their lives. He describes the characters with a truthfulness and vivacity that can be ascribed only to the evidence of an eye-witness. Sañjaya and others are presented in the epic without any introduction as the author did not feel the need for it. The language of the epic is virile, simple and grand showing that it was then a spoken language.

The epic, as it is available, contains a number of passages written in archaic prose. They are twenty in number, three in the *Ādiparvan*, seven in the *Vanaparvan*, seven in the *Śāntiparvan* and three in the *Anuśāsanaparvan*. Most of these are in the form of *Upākhyānas* and are narrated by some great sages. The scholars of the West hold the view that the *Mahābhārata* shows a prior date for its composition on account of these passages when compared with the Rāmāyaṇa. From the frequent references to the

Rāmāyaṇa incidents, it must be admitted that many such passages like these composed long long ago were included in the *Mahābhārata* by the narrators like Vaiśampāyana and others. The *Ādiparvan* contains the following *ślokas* which are misunderstood by many scholars.

ग्रन्थग्रन्थिं तदा चक्रे मुनिर्गूढं कुतूहलात् ।
यस्मिन् प्रतिज्ञया प्राह मुनिर्द्वैपायनस्त्विदम् ।।
अष्टौ श्लोकसहस्राणि अष्टौ श्लोकशतानि च ।
अहं वेद्मि शुको वेत्ति संजयो वेत्ति वा न वा ।।
तच्छ्लोककूटमद्यापि ग्रथितं सुदृढं मुने ।
भेत्तुं न शक्यतेऽर्थस्य गूढत्वात्प्रश्रितस्य च ।।

Mahābhārata-Ādi-1-116-118

Here it is stated that Vyāsa composed 8800 *ślokas* which were in the form of riddles. The scholars of the West have mistaken this as a reference to the number of *ślokas* composed by Vyāsa.[1]

A study of the epic shows that it underwent changes at the hands of at least two narrators. This is borne out by an internal evidence which refers to the divergent views that prevailed regarding the actual portion in the epic which marked its beginning.

मन्वादि भारतं केचिदास्तिकादि च तथापरे ।
तथापरिचरादन्ये विप्राः सम्यगधीयिरे ।।

Mahābhārata-Ādi. 1-66

The first reference cannot be identified in the present text of the *Mahābhārata*.[2] The second and the third shall refer to the chapters 13 and 64 respectively in the *Ādiparvan*. External evidences are available throughout the epic where the narrations of Vaiśāmpayana are stopped by Janamejaya[3] or of Sañjaya by Dhṛtarāṣṭra.[4]

Vyāsa composed the work called *Jaya* on the life of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas.[5] He calls it Itihāsa.

जयो नामेतिहासोऽयं श्रोतव्यो विजिगीषुणा ।

Mahābhārata- Ādi 62-22

He took three years to compose it.[6] Probably it began with chapter 66 or 63 in the *Ādiparvan*. What Vyāsa wrote was so overhauled by the later editors that it is not possible to mark out in the present text the portions he wrote. Gaṇeśa, the son of Śiva, wrote the epic as it was narrated by Vyāsa.[1] Vyāsa gave publicity to the work after the death of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. This work of Vyāsa represents the first stage in the evolution of the text of this epic.

---

[1] A.A. Macdonell : A History of Sanskrit Literature p. 284.

[2] The word मनु is taken by some scholars as a reference to the *Maṅgala Sloka* in the epic.

[3] *Mahābhārata* *Śalya* 35

[4] *Māhābhārata Bhīṣma* 5 to 12

[5] „ *Adi* 62-42

[6] „ *Adi* 62-55

At the bidding of his preceptor, Vaiśampāyana recited the *Jaya* in the presence of Janamejaya on the occasion of the latter's performance of the snake-sacrifice.[2] Janamejaya sought explanations and more details in the narration of Vaiśampāyana. Vaiśampāyana answered his query at every stage furnishing information composed by himself or reproduced from the literature available to him from older generations. Vyāsa's *Jaya* together with Vaiśampāyana's narrations represents the second stage of the epic in its evolution. Perhaps, chapter 61 in the *Ādiparvan* marked the beginning of this stage. Vaiśampāyana's narration consisted of 24000 *ślokas* and it was called *Bhāratasaṁhitā*. This excludes the *Upākhyānas*, which were narrated by him to Janamejaya.

Vide :—चतुर्विंशतिसाहस्रीं चक्रे भारतसंहिताम् ।
उपाख्यानैर्विना तावद्भारतं प्रोच्यते बुधैः ।।

Mahābhārata-Ādi 1-78

It is quite likely that the *Jaya* too contained approximately this number of *ślokas*, as Vaiśampāyana would not have added much to the *Jaya*.

Vyāsa had five pupils called Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila, Śuka and Vaiśampāyana, of whom Śuka was his son. All these composed or gave publicity to the composition of Vyāsa in their individual capacity.[3] Thier works are lost except for Vaiśampāyana's *Bhāratasaṁhitā* and the *Aśvamedhaparvan* of Jaimini.

Soon after the performance of the snakesacrifice by Janamejaya, Sauti, who attended this sacrifice, narrated what he heard from Vaiśampāyana to a sage called Śaunaka when the latter performed, in the Naimiṣāraṇya, a sacrifice which lasted for twelve years. At his hands, the epic reached the third and last stage of development. This edition came to possess one lakh of stanzas. The first fifty-nine chapters in the present edition of the *Mahābhārata* were prefixed by him to the *Bhāratasaṁhitā*. Sauti added a preface, an introduction and a table of contents to the epic. The *Jaya* was divided into one hundred sections (*parvans*). Sauti made a careful division of the epic into eighteen larger sections. Each section in the third edition contains a number of smaller sections.[4] This edition became huge and weighty and hence the name *Mahābhārata*.

Vide :—महत्त्वाद्भारवत्त्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते ।

Mahābhārata-Ādi-1,300

---

[1] *Mahābhārata-Ādi* 1-115

[2] *Mahābhārata- Ādi*60-22

[3] „ „. 64-131, 132

[4] „ „ 2-84, 85

The epic assumed one lakh of stanzas at the hands of Sauti.[1] Vaiśampāyana, however, states that Vyāsa reduced the number of sections into eighteen.[2]

The *Jaya*, which could have been of almost the same size as the *Bhāratasaṁhitā*,[3] should have assumed the bulky size of one lakh of stanzas on account of the matter extraneous to the main theme included there by Sauti, after hearing them from Vaiśampāyana. Some of the stories are repeated *e.g.*, those of Yayāti, Vṛtra and others. In the opinion of Vaiśampāyana, the epic was to contain matters on every topic under the sun.

यदिहास्ति तदन्यत्र यन्नेहास्ति न कुत्रचित् ।

Mahābhārata, Ādi 62-26

The present text of the epic however contains about 97000 *ślokas* excluding the *Harivaṁśa*. The work of Vyāsa included the *Harivaṁśa*.[4] The number of *ślokas* varies according to the editions available at present. Vaiśampāyana mentions that the work of Vyāsa comprised 2000 chapters.[5] The present editions of the epic contain about 1925 chapters. There is discrepancy regarding the number of chapters and the number of *ślokas* in each *parvan* as mentioned in the the second chapter of the *Ādiparvan* and as available in the printed texts of the present day. As is the case with the *Rāmāyaṇa*, loss of chapters and *ślokas* must have been made good by their addition which was made in excess of the normal number. It is not however possible to find out which chapters and how many *ślokas* were thus added.

The *Mahābhārata* text contains a reference regarding the date of the *Mahābhārata* war.

Vide :—अन्तरे चैव संप्राप्ते कलिद्वापरयोरभूत् ।
समन्तपंचके युद्धं कुरुपाण्डवसेनयोः ।।

Mahābhārata-Ādi 2-13

According to this reference, the battle was fought by the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas in between the *vāparayuga* and *Kaliyuga*. The Pāṇḍavas ruled the kingdom for thirty-six years.[6] Dhṛtarāṣṭra lived for eighteen years after the battle was over.[7] It is said in the *Bhāgavata* that the *Kali* age did not set in as long as Kṛṣṇa was on the earth and that the *Kaliyuga* set in the very same year Kṛṣṇa left the earth.[8] According to calculations in the almanacs, the *Kaliyuga* must have begun in 3102 B.C. These calculations could not be dismissed as untrustworthy, as they have been in vogue from very ancient days. There are six eras in the *Kaliyuga* under the names *Yudhiṣṭhira*, *Vikrama*, *Śālivāhana*, *Vijayābhinandana*, *Nāgārjuna* and *Bali*.[1] The *Śālivāhana* era, which is now running, was started in 78 A. D. It was preceded by the *Vikrama* era which started in 57 B.C. The *Yudhiṣṭhira* era which preceded the Vikrama era started with the beginning of the *Kali* age. It must have started in 3102 B.C. Kṛṣṇa must have left this world in 3102 B.C. in which year the Pāṇḍavas left the city on their final journey. That is, the battle must have been fought thirtysix years before *i.e.* in 3138 B.C. That the battle was fought in between the *Kali* and *Dvāpara yugas* is evident from the following references :—

---

[1] *Mahābhārata Adi* 1-127
[2] *Mahābhārata Ādi* 62-16
[3] Perhaps the *Jaya* contained 24000 *ślokas*. Vyāsa could have been influenced in this by the *Rāmāyaṇa* which contains the same number of *ślokas*.
[4] *Mahābhārata-Ādi* 2-83, 84
[5] *Mahābhārata Ādi* 62-16
[6] „ *Mausala* 1-1
[7] „ *Āśramavāsika* 41-25
[8] *Bhāgavata* XII-2-30

प्राप्तं कलियुगं ज्ञात्वा सहदेवो हसन्निव ।
राज्ञस्तु कथयामास धर्मोनष्टस्तु संकर: ।।

Mahābhārata-Mahāprasthānika 1-20

प्राप्तं कलियुगं विद्धि प्रतिज्ञां पाण्डवस्य च ।
एतत्कलियुगं नाम अचिराद्यत्प्रवर्तते ।। „ *Vana*

The *Purāṇas*[2] contain an astronomical reference to the time of the battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. The constellation Ursa Major (Saptarṣimaṇḍala) stood in the star *Maghā* when Parīkṣit was reigning.

सप्तर्षयो मघायुक्ता: काले पारिक्षिते शतम् ।

Matsyapurāṇa 271-46

ते तु पारीक्षिते काले मघास्वासन् द्विजोत्तम ।

Viṣṇupurāṇa 4-24-106

This constellation takes one hundred years for its transit from one star to the previous one[3]. The method of finding the star occupied by this constellation is given in the *Purāṇas*.

सप्तर्षीणां यौ पूर्वौ दृश्येते ह्युदितौ निशि ।
तयोर्मध्ये तु नक्षत्रं दृश्यते यत्समं दिवि ।
तेन सप्तर्षयो ज्ञेया युक्ता व्योम्नि शतं समा: ।।

Matsyapurāṇa 271-44, 45

According to this calculation, the Ursa Major is now in the star *Hasta* since 1923 A.D. It will be in the star *Maghā* from 2223 A.D., having been there before for a century from 477 B. C. and from 3177 B. C.

Vyāsa composed the *Jaya* while the Pāṇḍavas were alive. The epic was recited by Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya, the son of Parīkṣit who was coronated in 3102 B.C. by the Pāṇḍavas after which the latter took their last journey.[1] Parīkṣit ruled the kingdom for sixty years.[2] Janamejaya must have become king in 3042 B. C. The epic of Vyāsa could be taken to have been recited in 3042 or 3041 B.C. This is the date for the publicity of the *Jaya* and for the *Bhārata-saṁhitā*. In the same or next year, the *Mahābhārata* must be taken to have been given a definite shape by Sauti. This receives the support from the Indian astronomer *Ā*ryabha*ṭ*a who refers to the contemporaneity of the *Mahābhārata* war and the beginning of the *Kaliyuga*.

---

[1] The duration of each is 3044, 135, 18000, 400000 and 821 years respectively.

[2] cf. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4-24 *Matsyapurāṇa* 271 *Bhāgavata* XII 2 *Vāyupurāṇa* 99

[3] *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* XIII 4

The scholars of the West are reluctant to place a literary work at such a distant period and seek to assign the epic to the period about the beginning of the Christian era on the strength of references to the the *Mlecchas* and *Yavanas* in the epic. The *Mlecchas* and *Yavanas* are identified with the Greeks who came to India about 323 B.C. along with Alexander. This later date is supported by the reference in his work by the Greek writer Rhetor Dion Chrysostom that this epic with one lakh of stanzas was very well known in South India. This writer lived in the second half of the 1st century A.D. This must however be taken to prove the latest date for the size of the epic.

In this connection, it must be said that it is difficult to identify the *Yavanas* and the *Mlecchas*. The Yavanas could be identified with the Ioanians who were having contact with India long before the advent of the Greeks in India. The word '*mleccha*' refers to a tribe that does not follow the way of life as established in India. It may refer to any tribe that could have come into contact with the Indians. Hence much reliance cannot be placed on the occurrences of references to these in the epic. Even otherwise, these shall be considered as interpolations which are inevitable as in the case of this epic. This shall not affect the date of the epic which is fixed at the beginning of the *Kaliyuga*.

Mahābhārata as an epic and Dharmaśāstra..

The *Mahābhārata* is very popular as an *Itihāsa*. Like the *Rāmāyaṇa*, its popularity is due to characterisation, narrations and descriptions. The principles of *dharma* which it preaches have earned for it a prominent place among the *Dharmaśāstras*. This epic is frequently made use of as a reference book whenever any difference of opinion arises regarding the principles of *dharma*. It is not however made use of for daily recitation, like the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Occasionally, the *Virāṭaparvan* alone is recited and narrated and this is done only in a public place.

The characters in the *Mahābhārata* are all represented to be very bold, independent and outspoken. Each character is shown to have been subjected to trials and behave in an individualistic way. The cases of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Gāndhārī, Draupadī and Kuntī could be cited in this connection. Kuntī exercised remarkable influence on her sons, and goaded them to fight with the Kauravas.[1] She remained a passive witness of her sons' glories.[2] In this connection, her advice to Yudhiṣṭhira on the eve of her accompanying Dhṛtarāṣṭra to the forest is worth quoting.

---

[1] *Mahābhārata-Mahāprasthānika* 1

[2] *Mahābhārata Ādi*-49-17

> धर्मे ते धीयतां वुद्धिर्मनस्तु महदस्तु च ।
>
> *Mahābhārata Āśramavāsika* 18-21

Vyāsa was not deterred from recording the behaviour of the characters as it was noticed. Therefore, we find both the good and salient features in the conduct of the characters, their weaknesses and failings.

The major part of the *Jaya* and also the *Upākhyānas* is taken up by dialogues and narrations. The speeches are well-conceived, eloquent and forcible. The noteworthy feature of them is fearlessness on the part of the speakers in expressing what they felt. The following scenes deserve mention in this connection. 1. The military test for the Pāṇ*ḍ*avas and Kauravas held by Droṇa. 2. Life in the forest and the reflections thereon by Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma and Draupad*ī*. 3. Vidura's advice and taunts administered to Duryodhana[3] and 4. Vehement exchanges between Karṇa and Śalya.[4]

Vyāsa has relieved the monotony in the descriptions and narrations by making Sañjaya, the charioteer of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the narrator of them. The narrations of the happenings in the court, penance-groves and other places have got a realistic touch and therefore have a direct appeal to the readers.[5] Graphic and vivid are the descriptions of cities,[6] penance-groves,[7] courts,[8] *svayamvara*[9], battles, clouds of deluge[10] and others. The battles are described in detail throughout the epic.[11] Some of the descriptions[12] betray the influence of the *Ramayana*. Many *ślokas* from the *Rāmāyaṇa* are found reproduced here.[13] More than all this, the epic abounds in didactic passages. Few among them are given below :—

1. क्षमासारा हि साधवः । *Ādi* 72-5
2. यत्पृथिव्यां व्रीहियवं हिरण्यं पशवः स्त्रियः ।
   नालमेकस्य तत्सर्वमिति मत्वा शमं व्रजेत् ।। „ 69-54

---

1. *Mahābhārata-Udyoga*-132, 133 & 137
2. „ *Āśramavāsika*-17 & 18
3. „ *Sabhā*-87 *Udyoga*-130
4. „ *Karṇa*-31, 33, 34, 37, &38
5. „ *Virāṭa*-9 to 13
6. „ *Sabhā*-57.
7. *Mahābhārata-Ādi*-91 *Vana*-159
8. „ *Sabhā*-7to11
9. „ *Ādi*-200
10. „ *Vana*-191
11. „ *Droṇa*-36, 139, 157
12. „ *Strī*-16, *Vana*-147, 148, 159
13. *Mahābhārata-Ādi* 187,26; 73-4; *Vana*-65-15to 28, *Udyoga*-37-15

3. द्वाविमौ कण्टकौ तीक्ष्णौ शरीरपरिशोषिणौ ।
यश्चाधनः कामयते यश्च कुप्यत्यनीश्वरः ।। *Udyoga* 33 63
4. शोकस्थानसहस्राणि भयस्थानशतानि च ।
दिवसे दिवसे मूढमाविशन्ति न पण्डितम् ।। *Anuśāsana* 244-3
5. एकः स्वादु न भुञ्जीत एकश्चार्थान्न चिन्तयेत् ।
एको न गच्छेदध्वानं नैकः सुप्तेषु जागृयात् ।। *Udyoga* 33-53
6. यं भारं पुरुषो वोढुं मनसा हि व्यवस्यति ।
दैवमस्य ध्रुवं तत्र साहाय्यायोपपद्यते ।। *Droṇa* 160-27

Besides the main theme, the epic contains short narratives, and accounts didactic and ethical in spirit. Hence it is considered to be a *Dharmaśāstra*. It contains detailed accounts about the duties of kings, of persons in the four castes and the four orders in life, of donors (*dāna dharma*)[1], of those who are keen in getting themselves released from bondage (*mokṣadharma*)[2] and about those which are required to be performed in the hour of trials (*āpaddharma*).[3] The nature of sins and the methods of expiation therefrom are described.[4] Detailed information is given about the ceremonies performed in honour of the departed persons (*śrāddha*).[5] Qualifications for the ministers,[6] rules for the erection of the cities and their defences,[7] taxation-policy,[8] rules of warfare[9] and other aspects of administrative importance are treated in the epic.

The value and importance of the epic are heightened by its containing the *Bhagavadgītā*. It is in eighteen chapters and is included in the *Bhīṣmaparvan*. Primarily it is intended to exhort Arjuna to do his duty namely fighting with the enemies. Incidentally, it deals with various issues all raised by Arjuna for obtaining an explanation from the Lord. It contains vivid descriptions of the nature of God, self and matter and the interrelation between them. The duties of man are stressed. The paths of progress are exemplified. Self-surrender to God is advised as an easier method for an individual to gain the purpose of his undertakings.[10] *Karma*, *Bhakti* and *Jñāna* are set forth as the three ways leading a man to perfection. Great emphasis is laid on the need to perform one's duty irrespective of the circumstances[11]. Whichever way one takes up, one is required to follow the ethical principles which are spoken of as capable of perfecting a man[12]. The *Bhagavadgītā* is one of the most popular religious works of India and has been commented by reputed *Ācāryas* and rendered into many European and Indian languages.

---

[1] *Mahābhārata Anuśāsana*
[2] *Mahābhārata Śānti*-173 to 375
[3] „ *Śānti* 78, 131 to 172
[4] „ „ 33&34, *Anuśāsana*-135 to 139
[5] „ *Anuśāsana*-61&238
[6] *Mahābharāta Śānti* 85, 118
[7] „ *Śānti* 86&87
[8] „ „ 88.
[9] „ „ 95, 97, 100 to 103
[10] *Bhagavadgıtā* XVIII
[11] *Bhagavadgıtā* III
[12] „ XII

Besides, the importance of the *Mahābhārata* is great because of the treatment it gives to Kṛṣṇa. The stanza of benediction at the beginning of the epic glorifies Viṣṇu.

Vide :—नारायणं नमस्कृत्य नरं चैव नरोत्तमम् ।
देवीं सरस्वतीं व्यासं ततो जयमुदीरयेत् ।।

The epic is called *Nārāyaṇakathā*[1] and *Kārṣṇaveda*.[2] Bhīṣma's discourses in the *Śāntiparvan*[3] and on the occasion of the performance of the *Rājasūya*[4] glorify Kṛṣṇa and advocate the *Sāttvata* mode of worshipping Him. Kṛṣṇa was always present by the side of the Pāṇḍavas to protect them from dangers. The epic contains *Viṣṇusahasranāma*.[5] Other deities are also worshipped.[6]

Śaṅkarācārya, the great Vedāntin, speaks of the *Mahābhārata*, as a *Dharmaśāstra*. The epic became popular in Kamboja where an inscription of 600 A.D. states that the copies of the *Mahābhārata* were presented to a temple there and arrangements were made for the daily recitation of the epic.[7] The inscriptions written after the 5th century A.D. in and outside India refer to the *Mahābhārata* as an authoritative text for rewarding the donors and for punishing the wicked.

Conditio during Mahabh rat.

The epic throws abundant light on the state of society about the time of the epic. Parentage was honoured and the Brahmins were held in respect. Still, merit was considered as the sign of greatness. To all intents and purposes, Karṇa was the son of a charioteer but his eminence as an archer was never underrated. The rules of the castes were not in strict observance. Vidura, the son of a slave, was the acknowledged politician of the day. Droṇa was a Brahmin by birth but a Kṣatriya by profession. Dharmavyādha and Tulādhara, who were not Brahmins, were recognised as the authorities on law and duties. Despite the recognition given to the spirit of renunciation and the need for devotion and the gradual decline of the sacred rites in their importance, Janamejaya, Drupada and Yudhiṣṭhira performed sacrifices and Arjuna performed penance. The princes were given training in archery. Monarchy was the system of government. Gambling was considered a vice but was still practised. *Svayaṁvara* was the mode of chosing her husband by a bride of the princely class. Success in the test for archery qualified a prince for marrying the princess. Polygamy was observed by the ruling class.

---

1. *Mahābhārata-Ādi* 1-32
2. *Mahābhārata Ādi* 1-294
3. ,, *Śānti* 344 to 358
4. ,, *Sabhā* 39 to 62
5. ,, *Anuśāsana* 254
6. ,, *Droṇa* 80, 203 *Virāṭa* 8, *Śānti* 290
7. A. A. Macdonell : A History of Sanskrit Literature p. 288

The women used to cover their face with a veil. Following the husband on his death was practised by few women. There is reference to the idols[1] but temples and idol worship are not mentioned. The regions to the south of the *Vindhya* ranges were inhabited by civilised peoples like the *Colas*, *Pāṇḍyas*, *Āndhras* and others. In his expedition to the south, Arjuna came to Maṇalur on the banks of the river *Kāverī* and married Citrāṅgadā, the daughter of the Pāṇḍya king.[2] The *Rājasūya* sacrifice, performed by Yudhiṣṭhira, was attended by the kings of *Āryāvarta*, of the south, China, Persia and other places. The *Yavanas* took part in the battle. The lac house was built by Purocana, a *Mleccha*.

The life of the Indian nation, literature of the classical period and the peoples of the islands of Java, Bali and other eastern islands have been influenced by the *Mahābhārata*, as they have been by the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Kumrāila Bhaṭṭa, the great *Mīmāṁsaka* philosopher of the 7th century refers, in his *Tantravārtika*, to many sections of the *Mahābhārata*, and quotes from them. Bāṇa and Subandhu, the prose writers of the 7th century A.D. made use of the characters of the epic for purposes of comparison and rhetorical embellishments. Bāṇa refers to the recitation of this epic in the temple of Mahākāla. The epic was rendered into *Javanese* in 996 A.D.

Harivaṁśa is the supplement to the *Mahābhārata*. After enumerating the names of the sections in the epic, Sauti states that *Harivaṁśa* is the supplement of the epic and that it was composed by Vyāsa.

Vide :—हरिवंशस्ततः पर्व पुराणं खिलसञ्ज्ञितम् ।
विष्णुपर्व शिशोश्चर्या विष्णोः कंसवधस्तथा ॥
भविष्यं पर्वचाप्युक्तं खिलेष्वेवाद्भुतं महत् ।
एतत्पर्वशतं पूर्णं व्यासेनोक्तं महात्मना ॥

Mahābhārata-Ādi-2-83, 84

It contains about 16000 *ślokas*[3]. It is dīvided into three sections, *Harivaṁśaparvan*, *Viṣṇuparvan* and *Bhaviṣyaparvan* dealing respectively with Kṛṣṇa's ancestry, Kṛṣṇa's life and predictions of the future.

The short narratives (*upākhyāna*) in the epic are numerous. They form nearly four-fifth of the contents of the epic. Some among them are in prose. The prominent among them are the following :— Descent of Gaṅgā, Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, Paraśurāma, Cyavana, Śibi, Rāma (son of Daśaratha), Sāvitrī, Nahuṣa, Nala, Śakuntalā, Yayāti and the Destruction of the three cities by Śiva.

The epic was commented by 1. Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, the earliest to comment on the epic, who lived in the 14th century A.D., 2. Arjunamiśra, who mentions Sarvajñanārāyaṇa and 3. Nīlakaṇṭha, who lived in Kūrpara in Maharāṣṭra in the 16th century A.D. Of these, the commentary of the first mentioned writer is available in fragments while those of the remaining two have appeared in print. Besides, there are other less known commentaries on the epic. Criticisms of the epic are available in the *Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇaya* of Ānandatīrtha and *Mahābhāratatātparyasaṁgraha* of Appayadīkṣita.

---

[1] *Mahābhārata-Bhīṣma* 2-26 [2] *Mahābhārata-Ādi*. 235

[3] cf *Mahābhārata-Ādi*-2-380, 381 which states the number of *ślokas* as 12000

Rāmāyaṇa and *Mahābhārata as National Epics* —

A study of the two epics reveals how closely they resemble in many respects. In form, the *Mahābhārata* appears to be prior to the *Rāmāyaṇa* on account of the narratives contained there. While the *Rāmāyaṇa* has no reference to the story of the *Mahābhārata*, the latter refers to Vālmīki[1], and quotes lines from the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[2] Its characters of the *Mahābhārata* know the incidents of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The language and descriptions betray the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

While the *Rāmāyaṇa* is an ideal poem written mostly in an uniformly chaste style, the *Mahābhārata* is primarily an *Itihāsa* exhibiting writings in different styles on account of the incorporation therein of the narratives composed years before its composition. Hence the latter contains some narratives in prose while the *Rāmāyaṇa* has none of the kind. Being a poem, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is divided into cantos, and the *Mahābhārata*, being an *Itihāsa* has a different division viz., *adhyāya*.

Both the epics betray some similar features. The authors of both were sages and were the contemporaries of the heroes of their works. Both were recited on the occasion of the performance of the sacrifice. The narrators were the pupils of the authors. Both begin with a court scene followed by a period of exile for almost the same duration. The exiled parties win the friendship of the chief of a state which they visit. Then follow battle-scenes. Both have the same aim : "Vice may rise for a time but ultimate success crowns the head of virtue."

While the *Rāmāyaṇa* has only one hero, the *Mahābhārata* has many laying equal claim for prominence. The characters in the former lived up to the high principles which were preached in the latter to be followed by the reactionary characters. The strict idea of morality as evidenced by Sītā's fire-ordeal is remembered in the latter epic but appears not to have been insisted when the need arose for it. The rigid observance of the rules of the castes in the days of the *Rāmāyaṇa* seems to have got a bit relaxed in the days of the *Mahābhārata*. The ideal of the Vedic *dharma* pervades the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while the *Mahābhārata* displays, besides it, the many-sided practices of Hinduism.

---

[1] *Mahābhārata-Droṇa* 143-85

[2] *Mahābhārata-Droṇa* 143-85,86

The test for archery in the period of the *Rāmāyaṇa* was a simple one as contrasted from the complex one of the *Mahābhārata*. Ghaṭotkaca was the only demon taking part in the *Mahābhārata* war, while the monkey-hordes and the demons fought in Laṅkā. The *Mahābhārata* period shows an improvement in the mode of warfare. *Krauñcavyūha*, *Makaravyūha*, *Śyenavyūha*, *Padmavyūha* and others are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* as the names of the modes of stationing the armies in the battle field. Vālmīki's epic does not know anything about this, as also about *satī* which is referred to in the *Mahābhārata*.

The two epics have taken their rise in the Indian soil and developed in an atmosphere purely Indian without being influenced by any foreign ideology. The two epics were written to support the *Vedas* and the Vedic tradition.[1] This is attested by the authors of both the epics calling their works *Saṁhitā*. Both the epics preach and uphold Indian culture enshrined in the *Vedas*. They speak highly of the system of castes and orders (*āśrama*) in life. A Śambuka, not authorised to perform penance, was beheaded for doing it. Duryodhana and his supporters were all reduced to destruction as they did not practise the duty of the Kṣatriyas in the proper way. The later epic contains detailed account of the duties of people in this respect. The doctrine of *Karma* and the theory of transmigration, which were studied thoroughly and grasped in all their aspects, characterise the life and activities of the characters in both the epics[2]. From very early times, Indians had faith in the fourfold classification of aims in life. This classification, unknown outside India, would not have been given recognition without the previous experience of the people making them have such a classification. The four aims in life are *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*. The last one is related to the life after death on earth and the other three are concerned with life here. The word '*dharma*' does not admit of being rendered into English. It is derived as धरति विश्वम्. It means that which sustains the universe. It has got various senses like religious creed, merit etc.[3] It is used with many words not invariably associated with it *e.g.*, राजधर्म, दानधर्म, गृहस्थधर्म etc. It seems that the central sense of this word is the high spiritual ideal which should prompt an individual to discharge his duty without fear or favour and without expecting any result.[4] Perhaps, this idea of *dharma* is stressed in the *Gīta* upholding *karmayoga*. The characters in both the epics, Rāma, Yudhiṣṭhira, Vidura and others strove to preach this ideal under the name *dharma* by practising it themselves. They stood up against those who offended it and fought till the end. It is in this light that Rāma's career fits in with the terms of praise रामो विग्रहवान् धर्मः। Rama's submission to the order of exile served on him by Kaikeyī and

---

1. *Rāmāyaṇa* I 4-6 *Mahābhārata-Ādi*-1-24 2. *Rāmāyaṇa* V-25-13&18 *Mahābhārata-Śalya* 66-27, *Strī* 7-13 to 16
3. *Rāmāyaṇa* I 33-8,9; 25-18, 19; II 19-22; 27-28; III 6-14
4. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 10-63-7

the Pāṇḍavas' control of their wrath at the cunningness played upon them by the Kauravas have to be explained in this way. The word *artha* refers to material prosperity and the word *kāma* to the fulfilment of one's aims and desires. An *Itihāsa* shall contain instructions on these aims. The two epics deal with them and propagate them with this difference that the *Mahābhārata* deals at length with the fourth aim *mokṣa*, while the Rāmāyana confines itself to the other three. Both the epics emphatically declare that *dharma* alone shall be practised when it comes into clash with "*artha*" and "*kāma*." Vālin, Rāvaṇa and Daśaratha[2] suffered as they did not stick to *dharma* when assailed by *artha* and *kāma*. So is the case with Duryodhana.

Vide :—धर्मादर्थः प्रभवति धर्मात्प्रभवते सुखम् ।
धर्मेण लभते सर्वं धर्मसारमिदं जगत् ।। *Rāmāyaṇa III*-9-30
ऊर्ध्वबाहुर्विरौम्येष न च कश्चिच्छृणोति मे ।
धर्मादर्थश्च कामश्च स किमर्थं न सेव्यते ।।
न जातु कामान्न भयान्न लोभा—
द्धर्मं त्यजंज्जीवितस्यापि हेतोः ।—
नित्यो धर्मः सुखदुःखे त्वनित्ये
जीवो नित्यो हेतुरस्य त्वनित्यः ।।
Mahābhārata-Svargārohaṇa 5-75, 76

That God is present everywhere and indwells (*antaryāmin*) the selves is a very ancient doctrine. Realization of the truth of this makes one realise his limitations, treat others as himself and thus practise in life the spirit of tolerance. It is this spirit that is responsible for treating the world of animate and inanimate beings as one composite whole. At any rate, it has been possible for the Hindus to be tolerant of the foreigners who have come to this land and settled here. This spirit has given rise to the practice of *ahimsā*. The two epics contain references to this spirit[3] and therefore the quarrels and rivalries among the people did not reduce them to the state of despair and destruction. Lastly, the two epics show how mutual affection prevailed among the members in the families. The maternal affections are fully brought out in the cases of Kausalyā, Kuntī and Gāndhārī. On the side of the paternal cases, Daśaratha and Dhṛtarāṣṭra deserve mention. In "depicting scenes of domestic affection, and expressing those universal feelings and emotions which belong to human nature in all time and in all places, Sanskrit Epic poetry is unrivalled even by Greek Epos.[4]"

These are the striking features exhibited by the two great Indian epics. They reflect the character of the Indian nation and as such, are the national epics of India to the core. In his Preface to the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in English, Jawaharlal Nehru writes "I do not think any person can understand India or her people fully without possessing a knowledge of the two magnificent epics that are India's pride and treasure."

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa* II 21-58
Mahābhārata-Ādi 98-8

[2] *Rāmāyaṇa* II 53-13.

[3] *Rāmāyaṇa*-IV-18-15

[4] Monier-Williams : Indian Wisdom

CHAPTER X

PURAṆAS

The word '*purāṇa*' refers to stories of ancient origin. Its derivation is given thus :—

यस्मात्पुरा ह्यनति इदं पुराणम्

Vāyupurāṇa *I* 203

In the *Vedas* and the epics, this word occurs together with the words *itihāsa*, *ākhyāna* and others. Although there is difference between these according to their definitions[1], it appears that *Ākyhānas* and *Upākhyānas* were included under *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*. The *Purāṇas* must have been composed during the Vedic period giving information about the lives and activities of the warriors, kings, asectics and others and also about the creation of the world. In most cases, the authors are not remembered. In each *yuga*, they were altered, expanded or condensed according to the occasion.

The traditional definition of the *Purāṇa* is given as follows :—

सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।
सर्वेष्वेतेषु कथ्यन्ते वंशानुचरितं च यत् ।।

Viṣṇupurāṇa 3-6-24

According to this definition, a Purāṇa deals with the primary creation, secondary creation by the *Prajāpatis*, royal dynasties, the reigns of Manus and the royal races like those of solar and lunar descent. Judged in the light of this definition, the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* alone deserves the appellation of *Purāṇa*. Among the others, some deal with matters unrelated to the scope of the *Purāṇas* while some contain accounts according to the traditional definition in addition to the extraneous matter. Such a condition of these texts must be due to the non-availability of any particular text where the mass of floating literature composed in early days on all aspects of life, after some of them got included in the *Mahābhārata*.

There is much difficulty in deciding the authorship of the *Purāṇas* which are eighteen in number. According to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, Vyāsa wrote a *Purāṇasaṁhitā*.

Vide :—आख्यानैश्चोपाख्यानैर्गाथाभिः कल्पशुद्धिभिः ।
पुराणसंहितां चक्रे पुराणार्थविशारदः ।।

Viṣṇupurāṇa 3-6-15

---

[1] स्वयं दृष्ट्वार्थकथनं प्राहुराख्यानकं बुधाः ।
श्रुतस्यार्थकथनमुपाख्यानं प्रचक्षते ।।

From this, it is understood that Vyāsa composed an abridgement of the *Purāṇa* literature available then. In the very same *Purāṇa*, it is stated that Parāśara was blessed by Pulastya and predicted to become the author of the *Purāṇasaṁhitā*.[1] The contradiction between these two statements is to be solved by taking Parāśara to have written the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*[5], giving concisely the matter taken from the *Purāṇa* literature available then and by holding Vyāsa to have written a *Purāṇasaṁhitā*. It is said in the *Śivapurāṇa* that Brahmā, Parāśara and Śailālin were responsible for some *Purāṇas*.

Vide : –ब्राह्मन्तु ब्रह्मणा प्रोक्तं पाद्मं तेनैव शोभनम्।
पराशरेण कथितं वैष्णवं मुनिपुङ्गवाः ।
शैवं शैलालिना प्रोक्तम् ।

Śivapurāṇa.

This passage must be taken to convey that Brahmā, Parāśara and Śailālin edited or gave their own version of the ancient *Purāṇa* contents. Among the *Purāṇas*, the *Brahmapurāṇa* is said to be the oldest.

ब्राह्ममेव कृते चाद्यं पुराणं श्रुतिसम्मितम् ।

Matsyapurāṇa 53-4

आद्यं सर्वपुराणानां पुराणं ब्राह्ममुच्यते ।

Viṣṇupurāṇa 3-6-20

From this, it appears that before Parāśara and Vyāsa, there were Purāṇas which were associated regarding authorship with Brahmā, Śailāin and others. Romaharṣaṇa, a disciple of Vyāsa and Kāśyapa, Śāvarṇi and Śāṁśapāyana, pupils of Romaharṣaṇa, gave their own abridgements of the *Purāṇa* literature.[2] Including the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, and the *Purāṇasaṁhitā* of Vyāsa, the number of *Purāṇas* comes to six. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* gives a list of the eighteen *Purāṇas*. It appears that during the period of Parāśara and Vyāsa, the *Purāṇa* literature of the olden days were classified by many scholars into eighteen works which include the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. Vyāsa's name got somehow associated with all of them, he having been the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Probaly Vyāsa was in charge of the abridgements of the *Purāṇa* literature. It is in this way, justification is to be given for passages like

अष्टादश पुराणानि कृत्वा सत्यवतीसुतः ।
भारताख्यानमखिलं चक्रे तदुपबृंहणम् ।।

Matsyapurāṇa 53-70

Some however take objection to Parāśara's authorship of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, as it goes against the statement quoted above. They make Parāśara responsible for the preaching of the *Purāṇas*.[3]

Date of Puran

The date or dates of the composition of the *Purāṇas* cannot be fixed with any certainty. Many of them, as they are now available, could have been composed when the *Mahābhārata* was composed

---

[1] *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.1.30, 34

[2] *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 3-6-18, 19

[3] Dattātreya's *Subodhinī* on the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*-1-1-5

i.e. about 3100 B.C. Whether what all is contained in them was included then cannot be affirmed at this date, nor is there evidence to show that portions were added later. The scholars of the West seek to fix the 5th century A.D. as the latest limit when the *Purāṇas* assumed the present shape. The support for this conclusion is sought on the ground that while there is reference in the *Purāṇas* to the old dynasties of the princely families, there is no mention of king Harṣavardhana or his family whose date is assigned to the first half of the 7th century A.D. The chapter dealing with the royal dynasties is is called भविष्यद्राजवंशानुकथनम् making reference to the dynasties by using the verbs in the future tense.[1] The authenticity of such statements is denied. They are treated as interpolations by the scholars who do not believe in the ability of the composers of the *Purāṇas* for giving correct predictions of the future.

The *Purāṇas* are highly valuable for the information which they give about the royal dynasties. They deal with the dynasites of Parīkṣit, Ikṣvāku, Bṛhadratha, Pradyota, Śaiśunābha, Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Kāṅvas, Āndhrajātīyas, Āndhrabhṛtyas, Maunas and others. The scholars of the West, who undertook the task of writing ancient Indian history, depended entirely on the accounts contained in the *Purāṇas*. However, they reduced the duration of each dynasty considerably. Candragupta, mentioned in the records of Megasthenes and other Greek statesmen, is identified by these writers with *Maurya* Candragupta. This identification is erroneous and has no evidence whatsoever. The periods of the dynasties were calculated by the Western writers with reference to the date of *Maurya* Chandragupta about 320 B.C. An impartial study of the accounts contained in the *Purāṇas* reveals that Alexander and the Greek statesmen met the Gupta emperor Candragupta, the first king of the *Gupta* dynasty which began in 327 B.C.[2] The whole history of ancient India with reference to the dynasties requires to be written closely following the accounts given in the *Purāṇas* whose correctness is verified on the strength of the astronomical data contained in the *Purāṇas*.

The *Purāṇas* are valuable in another direction also. They have been responsible for the maintenance of theistic beliefs in the land. They deal with a number of gods and this is to enable a worshipper of a definite spiritual competence, choose a deity satisfying his spiritual longing and to make it the object of his adoration. Hence the *Purāṇas* glorify all forms of the Supreme Being conceived by men in the past. This is not polytheism. Hence the Purāñas declare all the gods to be equal and at the same time glorify a particular god in a given context. The worship of a particular deity is recommended but that of another is not prohibited. Thus they enjoin the exclusive worship of a deity but prohibit the preferential worship of that deity.

---

[1] *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4-21&22

[2] This question is discussed by Pandit Kota Venkatachelam in "The Plot in Indian Chronology."

The *Purāṇas*, which are stated to contain four lakhs of stanzas,[1] are in the form of conversation between interlocutors. In this they resemble the *Mahābhārata* whose didactic nature is also found reflected in them. The list of the *Purāṇas* is given as below :—

ब्राह्मं पाद्मं वैष्णवं च शैवं भागवतं तथा ।
तथान्यन्नारदीयं च मार्कण्डेयं च सप्तमम् ।।
आग्नेयमष्टमं चैव भविष्यन्नवमं स्मृतम् ।
दशमं ब्रह्मकैवर्तं लैंगमेकादशं स्मृतम् ।।
वाराहं द्वादशं चैव स्कान्दं चात्र त्रयोदशम् ।
चतुर्दशं वामनञ्च कौर्मं पञ्चदशं तथा ।।
मात्स्यंच गारुडंचैव ब्रह्माण्डं च ततः परम् ।

Viṣṇupurāṇa **3-6-21** to **23**

In this list, the *Bhāgavata* and *Śaiva* are sometimes substituted by the *Devībhāgavata* and *Vāyu* respectively. These *Purāṇas* are held to lend support to the worship of the three deities viz., Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra. Hence they are classified into three groups viz., *Rājasa* related to Brahmā, *Sāttvika* to Viṣṇu and *Tāmasa* to Śiva. Each deity has six *Purāṇas* dedicated to Him. This classification is not final or satisfactory, for the *Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Bhaviṣya Purāṇas* are in the least sectarian. Some *Purāṇas* like the *Brāhma* glorify the sun, although dedicated to Brahmā. The *Rājasa Purāṇas* are :— *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Brahmakaivarta*, *Mārkaṇḍeya*, *Bhaviṣya*, *Vāmana* and *Brāhma*. The *Sāttvika Purāṇas* are :— *Viṣṇu*, *Nārada*, *Bhāgavata*, *Garuḍa*, *Padma* and *Varāha*. The *Tāmasa Purāṇas* are :—*Matsya*, *Kūrma*, *Liṅga*, *Śiva*, *Skanda* and *Agni*.

The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* is a mere collection of some *Upākhyānas* dealing with the places of pilgrimage. It contains the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* which has seven books and though having the external form of a *Purāṇa* in the form of talks between Pārvatī and Śiva, it preaches *Advaita* and declares devotion to Rāma as the path leading to salvation. The *Purāṇa* describes the exploits of Paraśurāma and refers to Rādhā, consort of Kṛṣṇa. The *Brahmakaivarta*, also known as *Brahmavaivarta* for better reasons, declares all creations including the world as illusory. It contains four sections called *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, *Prakṛtikhaṇḍa*, *Gaṇeśakhaṇḍa* and *Kṛṣṇajanmakhaṇḍa*. At Kṛṣṇa's order, matter (*prakṛti*) changed into Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī and Rādhā. Gaṇeśa is mentioned as the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa. The *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* satisfies the definition of *Purāṇa*. It contains answers to the questions raised about the characters of the *Mahābhārata*. Indra, Brahmā, Agni, and Sūrya are glorified. It contains a number of *Upākhyānas* among which that of Hariścandra deserves mention. It contains the *Devīmāhātmya* glorifying the goddess Durgā. The *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* contains prophecies of the future and deals with the duties of the castes, and worship of the sun, fire and snake. It has a supplement called *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* which is a handbook of religious rites and places of pilgrimage. The *Vāmanapurāṇa* does justice to the definition of *Purāṇa* and begins with an account of Viṣṇu's incarnation as dwarf. Besides giving an account of Viṣṇu's other incarnations, it deals with the worship of *liṅga*, and glorification of Śiva and the places of pilgrimage dedicated to Śiva and describes the marriage of Pārvatī and Śiva. The *Brahmapurāṇa*, which is also called *Ādipurāṇa*, deals mostly with the sacred places particularly those located in Orissa (Ondhra) and rituals. It contains a supplement called Saurapurāṇa dedicated to the worship of the sun who is identified with Śiva. It has a reference to the temple of the sun built after 1241 A.D. at Konarka near Puri.

---

[1] Bhāgavata-XII-13-4 to 8

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, is unique among the *Purāṇas* by conforming strictly to the conditions regarding the subject-matter expected of it according to the definition of *Purāṇa*. It does not deal with any fast or ceremony sacred to Viṣṇu nor does it make any reference to the temples of Viṣṇu. The *Nārada* also known as *Bṛhannāradīya* contains descriptions of feasts and ceremonies. Through meditation and devotion to God, salvation is to be obtained. The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* is the most popular among the *Purāṇas*. It deals with the ancestry and life of Kṛṣṇa in twelve sections called *skandhas*. It contains 18000 *ślokas*. The tenth *skandha* is the most popular section which deals with Kṛṣṇa's exploits. Gautama Buddha and Kapila are mentioned as the incarnations of Viṣṇu. In style, it approaches the Vedic texts in some places and the classical texts in others. Like the epics, it contains beautiful descriptions. The *Pādmapurāṇa* sings in praise of the *Bhāgvata*. To what extent the devotee is indebted to God for which the former shall express his gratitude to the latter is conveyed in Kunti's appeal to Kṛṣṇa which runs as follows :—

विपदः सन्तु नः शश्वत्तत्र तत्र जगद्गुरो।
भवतो दर्शनं यत्स्यादपुनर्भवदर्शनम् ।।

Bhāgavata I. 8-25

This *Purāṇa* has numerous commentaries and renderings into the Indian languages. Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja did not mention this *Purāṇa* nor do their works contain any quotation from this. Ānandatīrtha was the earliest *Vedāntin* to quote from this *Purāṇa*. Rāmānuja quotes of course from the *Kūrma*, *Agni* and other Purāṇas. This does not however mean that the *Bhāgavata* was not composed in the days of Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* was taken by these two Vedāntins as the ideal *Purāṇa* and while Śaṅkara confined to refer to this *Purāṇa* alone in support of his arguments, Rāmānuja chose to quote from some other *Purāṇas* as well except this. *Harilīlā* is an index to the *Bhāgavata* by Vopadeva of the 13th century A.D.

The *Garuḍapurāṇa* deals with astronomy, astrology, medicine, grammar, the nature and value of precious stones and the rites performed to the dead. It gives a detailed account of the nature of hells.

and of the tortures there. The *Padmapurāṇa* has six sections called *Ādikhaṇḍa*, *Bhūmikhaṇḍa*, *Brahmakhaṇḍa*, *Pātālakhaṇḍa*, *Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa* and *Uttarakhaṇḍa*. The *Purāṇa* is named after the lotus (*padma*) from which Brahmā sprang. The second section makes a reference to *Jainism* and the third to Rādhā consort of Kṛṣṇa. Besides containing information on the observances sacred to the devotees of Viṣṇu, the Purāṇa deals with the lives of Rāma and Śakuntalā betraying close resemblance to the poem *Raghuvaṁśa* and the drama *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa. Many scholars hold that these portions in the *Purāṇas* should have been composed under the influence of Kālidāsa's works. The *Varāhapurāṇa* describes Viṣṇu's incarnation as the *varāha* and gives an account of the prayers offered to Viṣṇu by the earth conceived as a goddess.

The *Matsyapurāṇa* deals with festivals, sacred places, omens and the observances of the Śaivites and Vaiṣṇavites. It contains details regarding house-building, architecture and iconography. It makes references to the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, *Jainism*, *Buddhism*, *Āndhra* dynasty and *Nārasiṁha* and other secondary *Purāṇas*. Elāpuram, Rāmeśvaram, Tāmraparṇī, Śrīraṅgam and other places in South India are mentioned. The *Kūrmapurāṇa*, which originally had four *saṁhitās*, now has only one called *Brāhmīsaṁhitā*. Greatness of Śiva is brought out with stress being laid on the need to become a devotee of Śiva. It contains the *Iśvaragītā* and *Vyāsagītā* which recommend meditation and duty respectively as the means to get knowledge. The *Liṅgapurāṇa* describes the twenty-eight incarnations of Śiva and is ritualistic in character. The *Śivapurāṇa* is considered to be a part of the bigger *Vāyupurāṇa*. It contains seven *saṁhitās* under the names *Vidyeśvara*, *Rudra*, *Śatarudrī*, *Koṭirudrī*, *Umā*, *Kailāsa* and *Vāyavīya*. It deals with the glory of Śiva. It contains a chapter on music. Bāṇa refers to the recitation of this *Purāṇa* in his village. The *Skandapurāṇa* consisting of about 80000 *ślokas* has six *saṁhitās* with the names *Sanatkumārīya*, *Brāhmī*, *Vaiṣṇavī*, *Śaṅkara* also called *Agastya*, *Sūta* and *Saura*. It describes in detail the places sacred to Śiva. The *Kāśīkhaṇḍa*, in fifty sub-sections describes the temples of Śiva in and around Vārāṇasī. The *Sūtasaṁhitā*, which deals with the mode of worshipping Śiva, is commented in the *Tātparyadīpikā* by Mādhavācārya (C. 1350 A.D.) of Vijayanagar. The *Agnipurāṇa* is encyclopaedic in character. There is not a single subject which it does not treat or make a reference to.

The *Devībhāgavata* is treated by the worshippers of *śakti* as one of the eighteen *Purāṇas*. It glorifies Pārvatī under the name Devī, at the expense of all the gods including Śiva. The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a philosophical work in the garb of the *Purāṇa*. It contains six sections called *Prakaraṇas* with the names *Vairāgya*, *Mumukṣu*, *Utpatti*, *Sthiti*, *Upaśama* and *Nirvāṇa*.

Apart from these eighteen Purāṇas, there are eighteen secondary *Purāṇas* (*Upapurāṇas*). These also are attributed to the authorship of Vyāsa. They have more of the ritualistic element than the primary

Purāṇas. Some of them have the same names like the *Purāṇas*. The names of a few among them are *Narasimha*, *Vāyu*, *Sāmba*, *Bhāskara*, *Parāśara* and *Kālikā*.

There are some works of the nature of the *Purāṇas* but not included in the list of the *Purāṇas* or *Upapurāṇas*. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* deals with *Kāshmir Vaiṣṇavism*. The *Nīlamatapurāṇa* contains the doctrines taught by king Ṅīla, the cultural hero of the *Nāgas* in Kashmir. It is the earliest work dealing with the history of Kashmir. The *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa* makes Kapila, Vālmīki, Vyāsa and Buddha the incarnations of Viṣṇu. The geneologies of Nepal, which are partly Buddhistic in spirit, are the off-shoots of the *Purāṇa* literature. The same may be said of the Jain *Paṭṭāvalis*.

CHAPTER XI

PRE-KĀLIDĀSA KĀVYA PERIOD

The word *kāvya* means any literary piece produced by a poet. It is derivered as कवेः कर्म Hence it includes poems, prose, fables, tales, lyrics, dramas and others. Still, its use is restricted to the metrical compsitions though its use with reference to the other types of compositions is not forbidden.

Though the writing of the poems must have commenced from very early periods, the nature, scope and form of them appear to have been determined and definitions framed for them by the rhetoricians long after some of the prominent *kāvyas* were composed. Perhaps, these *kāvyas* themselves served as the models for framing the definitions. The poem called by the names *Mahākāvya* and *Sargabandha* shall begin with a benediction or a direct reference to the theme of the poem. It is to be divided into cantos (*sargas*). Each canto shall have the last stanza composed in a metre different from that or those in which the canto is composed. It must deal with the description of cities, mountains, sea, seasons, rise of the sun and moon, gardens, sports in water, drinking parties, love sports, festivals, love in separation, marriage, birth of son, counsels, ambassador, marching (towards an enemy), battle, prosperity of the hero and others. The subject matter may be based on traditional or any good theme. It must deal with the four-fold aims in life. It shall be embellished by figures of speech and shall be full of sentiments and emotions. Not being abridged, it shall be divided into cantos not unduly long.[1]

The period before Kālidāsa in regard to the poems is a dark one. The variety of metres skilfully handled by him, the figures of speech that adorn his poems and the acme of perfection reached by him as an artist show that before him, the kāvya had a long period of graded development at the hands of a number of writers. His works must have eclipsed most of the works of his predecessors. Among them, the name of Vālmīki proudly and justly styled as *Ādikavi* and his epic *Rāmāyaṇa* have been handed down to posterity. The name of the great grammarian Pāṇini is associated in the anthologies with two works *Pātālavijaya* and *Jāmbavatīvijaya* which are known only in some stray quotations preserved in the anthologies. Pāṇini's fancy in description is revealed in the stanza :—

गतेऽर्धरात्रे परिमन्दमन्दं
गर्जन्ति यत्प्रावृषि कालमेघाः ।
अपश्यती वत्समिवेन्दुविम्बं
तच्छर्वरी गौरिव हुंकरोति ॥

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa* I 14-19

Vararuci, also known as Kātyāyana and author of the *Vārtika* on the *sūtras* of Pāṇini, is said to have written a poem known as *Vārarucam kāvyam* after his name. The *Chandaḥsūtra* on prosody was written by Piṅgala also called Piṅgalanāga and referred to, by ṣaḍguruśiṣya in his *Sarvānukramaṇīṭīkā*, as the younger brother of Pāṇini. It contains eight *adhyāyas*. The metres dealt with by him stand midway between those of the Vedic and classical periods. The names of metres treated by him are identical with the names of the women whom he describes in the stanzas serving as illustrations, *e.g.*, *Cañcalākṣikā*, *Kuṭilagati* etc. The date of this work cannot be fixed with certainty. Nothing beyond this is known about the predecessors of Kālidāsa.

CHAPTER XII

KĀLIDĀSA

About Kālidāsa, the prince among the *Saṁskṛta* poets, nothing is known from the biographical point of view nor is available any direct evidence to determine his date with a fair degree of certainty. Many stories have however risen about him connecting him with the court of Kumāradāsa of Laṅkā (500 A.D.) and that of king Bhoja of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.) Though amusing and interesting, these have to be completely ignored, as the acceptance of these would give rise to chronological difficulties. A poet Padmagupta by name, who flourished in the court of king Bhoja of Dhārā, won the title *Parimala-kālidāsa* by skilfully imitating Kālidāsa. Stories about this poet must have got associated with Kālidāsa, due to the title of the former bearing a likeness with the name of the latter. One among these stories makes Kālidāsa a born dullard but having become an eminent poet through the grace of Kālī. Versions like these about Kālidāsa are far removed from truth and hence do not deserve serious consideration.

The lowest limit for the date of Kālidāsa is available from some reliable sources. Bāṇa (C.600 A.D.) the famous prose writer refers to Kālidāsa in his *Harṣcarita*.[1] A reference is made by Daṇḍin (C.700 A.D.) in his *Avantisundarī*.[2] Kālidāsa's name is mentioned in the Buddhagaya inscription dated 472 A.D. of Mahānāman and along with that of Bhāravi in the Aihole inscription dated 634 A.D.[3] Vatsabhaṭṭi's inscription at Mandasor dated 473 A.D. bears the influence of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandeśa*. From these evidences, it is clear that Kālidāsa must have lived before the middle of the 5th century A.D.

An attempt was made by some scholars to show Kālidāsa's indebtedness to Āryabhaṭa (C.500 A.D.) Kālidāsa is said to have taken the astronomical terms like *jāmitra*[4] from Āryabhaṭa who was influenced by the Greek astronomy but the astronomical science had its origin and independent development in India and these terms are found used in the *Gṛhyasūtras* of Bodhāyana (C.500 B.C.).

The evidence, based on a *śloka* making Kālidāsa, one of the nine gems in the court of Vikramāditya, has been responsible for adding to the difficulties caused by the absence of evidence. The *śloka* runs thus :—

धन्वन्तरिक्षपणाकमरसिंहशंकु—
वेतालभट्टघटकर्परकालिदासाः ।

---

1. *Harṣacarita*-Introductory verse 16
2. *Avantisundarī*. " " 15
3. विजयतां रविकीर्तिः कविताश्रितकालिदासभारविकीर्तिः ।
4. *Kumārasambhava* VII. 1. The word *jāmitra* and the word *diametron* are said to be phonetically similar.

ख्यातो वराहमिहिरो नृपतेः सभायां
रत्नानि वै वररुचिर्नव विक्रमस्य ।।

According to this *śloka*, Dhanvantari, Kṣapaṇaka, Amarasiṁha, Śaṅku, Vetālabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira and Vararuci were the nine poets who were patronised by Vikramāditya. Among these, Amarasiṁha, the author of the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, is placed between 400 A.D. and 600 A.D. Ghaṭakarpara is the author of a *Ghaṭakarparakāvya* but his date is not ascertained. Varāhamihira was the great Indian astonomer who died in 587 A.D. Vararuci could have been the author of the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* but his date is not known. Dhanvantari's identity is not known. *Kṣapaṇaka*, Śaṅku and Vetālabhaṭṭa are mere names to us. The evidence of this *śloka* cannot therefore be admitted. Besides, this *śloka* occurs in an astronomical work *Jyotirvidābharaṇa* of the 16th century A.D. attributed to Kālidāsa. The scholars of the West placed reliance on this *śloka* and began to identify Vikramāditya mentioned here. Except for this *śloka* of recent origin, there is no traditional evidence to connect Kālidāsa with a king of the name Vikramāditya.

There were a number of kings in ancient India with the name Vikramāditya. The prominent among them were the king of Ujjayinī, the founder of the era in 57 B.C., the *Gupta* emperors Candragupta II (357-413 A.D.) and Kumāragupta I (413-455 A.D.) and Harṣa Vikramāditya of Ujjain (C. 544 A.D.). Kālidāsa could not have lived in the court of the last mentioned king. The first mentioned king was only a legendary figure according to the Western scholars. The remaining two kings belonging to the *Gupta* dynasty could have patronised Kālidāsa. It is learnt that the *Gupta* emperors patronised arts and learning and Samudragupta (330-357 A.D.), father of Candragupta I, was himself a man of letters besides being a patron of poets.[1] Absence of information about poets after Aśvaghoṣa (C. 100 A.D.) and before Samudragupta (330-357 A.D.) led the Western scholars treat this period as a dark one for literature and give to the *Gupta* emperors the credit for having revived *Saṁskṛta* learning on the basis of inscriptional evidences, edicts etc. Taking their support on the *śloka* which connects Kālidāsa with Vikramāditya and on the title Vikramāditya assumed by the two *Gupta* emperors Candragupta II and Kumāraguta I, the Western scholars have taken a fancy in associating Kālidāsa's name with the courts of these emperors thus justifying their responsibility for the revival of *Saṁskṛta* learning.

In support of this theory, the scholars of the West suggest that the titles *Kumārasambhava* and *Vikramorvaśīya* of the works of the poet should have been suggested by the name Kumāragupta and the title Vikramāditya of his patrons. The victorious march of Samudragupta must have guided Kālidāsa in describing Raghu's victorious march (*digvijaya*). The reference to the defeat of the Huns by Raghu bears reference to the defeat of the Huns at the hands of Skandagupta who came to the throne in 455 A.D.

---

[1] विद्वज्जनोपजीव्यानेककाव्याक्रियाभिः प्रतिष्ठितकविराजशब्दस्य

In addition to these evidences, it is held that Kālidāsa refers to his rival Diññāga in the passage[1] दिङ्नागानां पथि परिहरन् स्थूलहस्तावलेपान् । The interpretation of the word *diññāgānām* as of Diññāga is supported by two commentators[2] on this poem *Meghasandeśa*, while the earlier commentator[3] does not make any reference to this.

A strong and final evidence is brought in by the Western Scholars in support of this theory. Aśvaghoṣa's description[4] of Gautama Buddha's passing through the streets of the city as witnessed by the womenfolk is strikingly similar to Kālidāsa's description of Siva's entry[5] into Oṣadhiprastha and that of Aja and Indumatī into Ayodhyā[6]. "To deny or minimise the influence of Aśvaghoṣa on Kālidāsa is idle."[7] Aśvaghoṣa is said to have lived in the court of king Kaṇiṣka in the 1st century A.D. Kālidāsa is said to have been influenced by the poetry of Aśvaghoṣa to produce more refined poems. All these arguments are put forward to establish Kālidāsa's contact with the court of the *Guptas*.

A study of the works of Kālidāsa shows that the theory of making Kālidāsa a protege of the *Gupta* court is baseless. The word *kumāra* is such a common word in the *Saṁskṛta* language that it refers only to Skanda and not to any other person. The hero in the drama *Vikramorvaśīya* is Purūravas. The title of the play refers to the work in which the heroine Urvaśī was won by Purūravas displaying his valour. The hero is neither called Vikrama nor does he have the title Vikramāditya. The *Gupta* emperors had nothing to do with this. Samudragupta's victorious march, which was repelled by the Pāṇḍya king on the banks of the river Kāveri, would not have served as a model for describing Raghu's victorious march which extended to the southernmost regions of the peninsula. The Huns were there giving trouble to the Indian kings from early times. The earliest reference to them is contained in the Manusmṛti,[8] then in the Mahābhārata[9] and the latest one in Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*[10]. Hence this is not a strong argument in support of the theory. Besides, Kālidāsa would not have been induced to be influenced by this incident which happened 'when the fortune of the royal house was evidently tottering to a fall'[11].

The evidence based on the use of the word *diññāgānām* is not convincing, as no external evidence is put forward in support of interpreting this word in the sense of the name of the famous Buddhist logician. The enemy would not have been referred to by the use of the word in the plural number. Kālidāsa was a Hindu poet and certainly not a philosopher engaged in any dispute with the Buddhist logician. Therefore there would not have existed any rivalry between Kālidāsa and Diṅnāga. The word *diṅnāgānām* shall be taken to convey the sense' of elephants of the quarters.'

---

[1] *Meghasandeśa* I-14

[2] *Dakṣiṇāvartanātha* (1200 A.D.) *Mallinātha* (C.1400 A.D.)

[3] *Vallabha* (C. 950 A.D.)

[4] *Buddhacarita* III-13-24

[5] *Kumārasambhava* VII-56-62

[6] *Raghuvaṁśa* VII-5-11

[7] A.B. Keith: "Classical Sanskrit Literature (Heritage of India Series)" p. 22

[8] Manusmṛti-X-44

[9] Mahābhārata-Ādi-191-40

[10] *Harṣacarita* V

[11] A.B. Keith : "Classical Sanskrit Literature (Heritage of India Series)" p.30.

There is striking similarity between the descriptions in the *Buddhacarita* on the one hand and the *Kumārasambhava* and *Raghuvaṁśa* on the other. The contexts for the description are however different. Gautama is passing through the street not in a procession and certainly not during the night. The women are stated to have woke up from sleep. They rushed to the windows to have a look at Gạutama without attending to their toilet. In the *Kumārasambhava*, Śiva is stated to be entering Oṣdhiprastha for marrying Pārvạtī. Naturally, the women flock to the windows to have a look at Śiva. Aja and Indumatī, the married pair, enter Ayodhy*ā* in a procession which attracts the women of the city. In both these cases, the haste with which the women gathered at the windows and the want of time for them to attend to the tiolet are natural and justifiable. It is quite natural to expect women's curiosity to be aroused on these occasions. The description of a like behaviour of the women at the odd hour is quite out of the nature of the women. Hence it is idle to speak of Aśvaghoṣa as having influenced Kālidāsa. Besides, the lines of the description of this scene in both the works of Kālidāsa are the same and follow in the same order. Had Kālidāsa been the borrower, he would not have given his descriptions of the scenes in this glaring manner. In this connection, it is worth drawing a reference to a similar description in the *Bhāgvata*.[1] If it could be proved that the *Bhāgavata* influenced both Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa, then this evidence for fixing Aśvaghoṣa' priority to Kālidāsa falls to the ground. If however it is possible to prove that Kālidāsa could not have been influenced by the *Bhāgvata*, then Aśvaghoṣa cannot be proved to be Kālidāsa's predecessor. Besides, Aśvaghoṣa displays his skill in the frequent use[2] of verbal forms of the same kind. If Kālidāsa had been a later writer, then his works would have exhibited the fondness for these forms to an exceedingly greater degree.

Since the connection of Kālidāsa with the court of the *Guptas* cannot be maintained, it is worth finding whether Kālidāsa was connected with the court of any other thing. The Indian scholar is able to conceive of only a Vikramāditya and a Bhoja as munificent patrons of learning. This intuitionistic opinion cannot be questioned on the ground of the lack of evidences to support this, for then racial memory as such, even in the cases of trained minds, could not be relied upon. Since Bhoja who ruled in the 11th century A.D. could not have been Kālidāsa's patron, it is necessary to find out whether any other Vikramāditya could have patronised him. The *Gupta* kings could not have been his patrons. The king, with the name Vikramāditya, who founded the era in 57 B.C. is not a legendery figure. Sātavāhana's *Gāthāsaptaśatī* refers to king Vikramāditya and his munificence[1]. This work was written under the *Sātvāhaṇas* who flourished from 73 B.C. to 218 B.C.[2] It refers to king *Śālivāhana* who founded an era in 78 A.D.[3]

---

[1] *Bhāgavata* X-41-24 to 28

[2] *Buddhacarita*-II *Saundarananda*-II

The frequent use of the word *mahendra* in the sense of Indra and of the word *vikrama* in the sense of valour in the *Vikramorvaśīya* shows that Kālidāsa is indirectly referring to king Mahendrāditya and his son Vikramāditya whose exploits were glorified in the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya and now available in its abridgements.[4] Perhaps the *Vikramorvaśīya* was written to glorify the achievements of his patron Vikramāditya and Mahendrāditya. This Vikramāditya started the era in 57 B.C.

Kālidāsa is said to have been sent by Vikramāditya as an ambassador to the court of Kuntaleśvara where he composed a work named *Kunteśvaradautya* which is now lost. This king Kuntaleśvara is Identified by the historians with Pravarasena II of the Vākāṭaka family which had matrimonial alliances with the *Gupta* emperors. This identification does not appear to be sound, since there was a king Kuntalaśātakarṇi by name among the *Sātavāhanas* who held sway over a large domain which included Kuntala. Kālidāsa was perhaps sent by Vikramāditya the founder of the era in 57 B.C. to the court of Kuntalaśātakarṇi or some other king ruling at that time in Kuntala. Further research in ancient Indian history may throw light on the identity of Kunteśvara.

The uniqueness of the *Bharatavākya* of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* containing the word Agnimitra, the name of the hero of the play, suggests that Kālidāsa could have lived in the court of Agnimitra (C. 180 B.C.) or must have lived at a time when the memories of the people would have been fresh with the story of Agnimitra. The feud between Yajñasena and Mādhavasena and the theme of this drama itself lend support to this contention. The reference[5] in the *Meghasandeśa* to Vidiśā as a flourishing city which fell into ruins in the third century A.D. may also be cited here.

The severe punishment for theft[6] and the law of inheritance[7] as found referred to in the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* show that the author must have lived at a period when support for these was available from the lawbooks of Manu, Vasiṣṭha and Āpastamba and when those of Bṛhaspati, Yājñavalkya and others did not yet become authoritative. This points to a period before the Christian era.

---

[1] *Gāthāsaptaśatī* V 64

[2] Collected works of R.G. Bhandarkar Vol. II p.52

[3] *Gāthāsaptaśatī* V 67

[4] *Kathāsaritsāgara*-120-124

[5] *Meghasandeśa*-I 25

[6] *Abhijñānaśākuntala* Act V

[7] „ Act VI

Certain expressions like *prabhaviṣṇu pelava*, *triyambaka*, and others as also the splitting up of the periphrastic perfect show that Kālidāsa wrote at a time when the rules of grammar enjoined by Pāṇini and others did not yet become binding on the poets. This is suggested by an indirect reference to a passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (150 B.C.).

Vide : - चतुष्टयी शब्दानां प्रवृत्तिः ।

Mahābhāṣya

प्रवृत्तिरासीच्छब्दानां चरितार्था चतुष्टयी ।

Kumārasambhava II 17

There is one more evidence which would place Kālidāsa in the 1st century B.C. Abhinanda, (C. 850 A.D.), the author of the *Rāmacarita*, states that the compositions of Kālidāsa were made renowned by Śakārāti[1] who was no other than Vikramāditya.

Vide :—ख्यातिं कामपि कालिदासकृतयो नीताः शकारातिना ।

Rāmacarita XXXIII

This proves clearly that Kālidāsa could have lived the major part of his life under Mahendrāditya and spent the last years under Vikramāditya the founder of the era in 57 B.C. He must have known very intimately about the life of Agnimitra. As it is, he could be taken to have lived about 50 B.C.

Kālidāsa is the author of two poems, *Kumārasambhava* and *Raghuvaṁśa*. These are the two among the five well-known *Mahākāvyas*. The list of works whose authorship is attributed to Kālidāsa gives the number of such works as forty-one. Among these, except the first six or seven works, all are considered to be spurious.

The *Kumārasambhava* is a *mahākāvya* in eight cantos describing the circumstances that led to the birth of Kumāra. The poem has an abrupt ending in the last canto which deals with the description of love of the divine pair. Perhaps, the censure of the critics of the day dissuaded the author from writing further. A later writer, finding the title inadequate for the poem, composed nine more cantos in continuation leading the theme up to the destruction of Tāraka by Kumāra. That Kālidāsa could not have been the author of these is clear from the silence of the rhetoricians over this portion and the expressions therein which Kālidāsa would have avoided. The poem contains vivid descriptions of the Himālayas, spring season, Śiva in meditation, lament of Rati over the death of Cupid and the talk between Pārvatī and Śiva in disguise. The description of the marriage of Pārvatī and Śiva shows Kālidāsa as a close observer of the traditional practises.

---

[1] Cf. साहसांकः शक्रारातिः स्याद्विक्रमादित्य इत्यपि । *Jaṭādhara*

The *Raghuvaṁśa*, in nineteen cantos, describes the lives of a few kings of the solar race. The poet chose to deal with some prominent kings in the race like Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja, Daśaratha, Rāma, Kuśa, Lava and the further successors. The poem has an abrupt end stopping with the death of the licentious Agnivarṇa. The death of the author must have prevented the work from getting completed. In diction, charm and style, this poem approaches the *Meghasandeśa* and the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* and must have been written after the *Kumārasambhava*. That the latter work could have been the result of the poet's mature genius owing to the treatment of love in its spiritual aspect as in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* cannot be conceded, as the subject matter for the poem was taken by the poet from the *Śiva-purāṇa* or an old version treating this theme. Kālidāsa could not possibly give in the *Raghuvaṁśa* treatment to the spiritual aspect of love, for want of proper context.

The *Raghuvaṁśa* is a *Mahākāvya par excellence* containing all aspects of the *kāvya* presented to perfection. Unlike the former poem, this begins with a benediction. Written in a rigorous style, the poem describes the life of Dilīpa, his attendance on Nandinī, Raghu's encounter with Indra, his victorious march, Indumatī's *svayaṁvara* followed by her marriage with Aja and Aja's lament over the death of Indumatī. Daśaratha's hunt in the spring and description of the return journey of Rāma from Laṅkā disclose the poet's study of the beauties of Nature. Canto XIV reveals the poet's deep insight into the workings of the human mind under trials. Appearance of Ayodhyā before Kuśa in the form of a dame and Kuśa's sport in water are given a realistic colouring by the poet. Canto XVIII is a mere list of the descendents in the family and the last canto portrays the life of the libertine whose excesses hastened his death.

The two poems, when taken together, present Kālidāsa as the greatest poet in the classical period. They are to be considered as the two parts of a composite whole depicting all the admirable features of the world and worldly life. Traditional scholars could not contain their admiration at the poet's choice of the flame of the torch to compare the movement of Indumatī in the court on the occasion of her *svayaṁvara*[1] and have chosen to designate him दीपशिखा कालिदास.

---

[1] *Raghuvaṁśa* VI-67

CHAPTER XIII

POST-KĀLIDĀSA KĀVYAS

The writer about whom there is reliable evidence and who came after Kālidāsa is Aśvaghoṣa. He is the author of two *Mahākāvyas Saundarananda* and *Buddhacarita*. It is learnt from the colophon of the former that he was the son of Suvarṇākṣī and a resident of Sāketa. He had the titles *Bhikṣu*, *Ācārya*, *Bhadanta*, *Mahākavi* and *Mahāvādin*. He proved his worth by making the horses listen to his discourses leaving aside the fodder and hence his name. The Chinese tradition makes him a contemporary or preceptor of Kaniṣka who ruled India in the 1st century A.D. The date of the author may be fixed during this period.

The *Saundarananda* in 18 cantos describes how Gautama converted into the Buddhist order his half brother Nanda who was reluctant to leave his wife. Ānanda, one of the pupils of the Buddha, persuaded Nanda by his teachings to become a recluse. At the end of the poem, the author says he wrote the poem in order to propagate the *Buddhistic* doctrines.[1] The *Buddhacarita* was originally composed in 28 cantos and was rendered into *Chinese* and *Tibetan*. The poem has been reconstructed into *Saṁskṛta* for 13 cantos with a supplement of four more cantos by one Amṛtānanda of the last century. It describes the life of the Buddha and contains the doctrines of *Buddhism* presented in an attaractive form.

Aśvaghoṣa betrays the influence of Vālmīki[2] and Kālidāsa[3]. Both the poems abound in alliteration and show the author's fondness for rare grammatical forms. They abound in forms foreign to *Saṁskṛta e.g.*, खिक्खिरी, विहेठयितुं, इज्जित, लोषतः etc.

After Aśvaghoṣa, no poet of repute is known to have flourished for nearly three centuries. In order to explain the absence of literary activity of a high standard during this period, Prof. Max Muller propounded his Renaissance theory to the effect that "the Indians, in consequence of the incursions of the *Śakas* (Scythians) and other foreigners, ceased from literary activity during the first two centuries A.D." and that "in the middle of the sixth century A.D. the reign of a king Vikramāditya of Ujjain, with whom tradition connected the names of Kālidāsa and other distinguished authors was the golden age of Indian court poetry"[4]. Based on this theory was a statement made according to which the "real history of the

---

[1] *Saundarananda*-XVIII-63

2.	*Cf.* ,,	VI-34	*with*	*Rāmāyaṇa*	V-10-54
3.	*Cf.* ,,	IV-42	*with*	*Kumārasambhava*	V-85
		VIII-44		,,	V-64
	,,	XVI-84		,,	I-59
	,,	XII-9		*Raghuvaṁśa*	XV-9
	Buddhacarita	XI-43		*Megasandeśa*	II-48
	,,	I-41		*Raghuvaṁśa*	III-14

[4] A.A. Macdonell: A History of Sanskrit Literature pp. 322 & 323

Kāvya or artificial epic poetry in India, does not begin till the first half of the seventh century A.D."

This theory was exploded by the researches conducted by Bühler and Fleet. According to their findings, the Scythians and other foreigners became Hinduised and patronised learning, architecture and sculpture. Ṛṣabhadatta, Kaniṣka, Rudradāman and others became patrons of *Saṁskṛta*. Moreover, these foreigners subjugated about one-fifth of India, their sway not having extended beyond Punjab, Gujarat and Rajputana. Therefore they could not have caused the decline of *literary pursuits* in the remaining parts of India. The foreigners were overthrown in 544 A.D. by Yaśovarman Viṣṇuvardhana and not by Vikramāditya.

There are evidences to show that literary activities continued uninterrupted during this period. King Rudradāman wrote an inscription in 150-2 A.D. at Girnar in the former Junagadh state (now in Saurāṣṭra) to celebrate the restoration of the Sudarśana lake. Vide :—शब्दार्थगान्धर्वन्यायाद्यानां विद्यानां महतीनां पारणधारणविज्ञानप्रयोगावाप्तविपुलकीर्तिना...स्फुटलघुमधुरचित्रकान्तशब्दसमयोदारालंकृतगद्यपद्य...स्वयमधिगतमहाक्षत्रपनाम्ना नरेन्द्रकन्यास्वयंवरानेकमाल्यप्राप्तदाम्ना महाक्षत्रपेण रुद्रदाम्ना ।

Epigraphica Indica Vol. VII p. 36

The king, the author of this inscription, was acquainted with the rules of poetics, as evidenced here. His style reminds us of the ornate prose of later days. The Nasik inscription was written in the 19th year of Siri Pulumāyi, king of Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī. Identity of Pulumāyi cannot be had, as there were more than one king with this name in the *Āndhrajātīya* dynasty. The date of the inscription is fixed in 149 A.D. It appears that this inscription represents a rendering into *Prākṛta* from the original composed in *Saṁskṛta*. It is filled with long compunds, abounding in alliteration and alluding frequently to the stock comparisons of the *Kāvyas*.

The *Gupta* period has two important inscriptions. The first one is by Hariṣeṇa who wrote a panegyric of his patron Samudragupta. It is recorded in a pillar at Allahabad and is dated 345 A.D. Written in the *Vaidarbhī* style, it begins with eight stanzas followed by a long prose and ends with a stanza. The author exhibits his skill in the employment of the figures of speech. The clause साध्वसाधूदयप्रलयहेतुपुरुषस्याचिन्त्यस्य applies, by the use of *śleṣa*, to the king and God. The other inscription dated 400 A.D. was written by Vīrasena, minister of Candragupta II praising himself and his patron as men of literary talents.

Apart from these and other inscriptions, a work with the name *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana belongs to this period. Here is depicted the ideal life which a man of fashion must lead. Directions are given as to how he should behave, spend the time, and have a good company. The account of life, depicted here, has left a lasting influence on the writers who came later. The result of this has been the introduction of certain scenes and devices, like the painting board, dance, parrot, love-letter and others for the purpose of making progress in the plot. It is the convention, bound by the *Kāmasūtra*, that dominates the scenes in the drams written after this period. This work makes a reference to a king of the *Sātavāhana* dynasty which came to an end about 218 A.D. The work shall therefore be placed about 150 A.D.

These evidences show that the literary pursuits were not given up during this period. While the inscriptions like those of Rudradāman and Hariṣeṇa were written during this period, it is proper to assume that literary compositions too should have been produced during the same period. Non-availability of historical data and perhaps the loss of works written during the period prevent us from having a correct picture of the literature during this period.

Meṇṭha or Bhartṛmeṇṭha also called as Hastipaka, who was patronised by *Mātṛgupta* of Kashmir (C.430 A.D.), is known to have written a poem called *Hayagrīvavadha*. It is available only in citations from it in the works on rhetorics.

In 472 A.D. was written a panegyric by Vatsabhaṭṭi and is inscribed in a pillar near Mandasor. It was composed by him, at the request of the silk-weavers of the locality, to commemorate the consecration of the temple of the sun at Daśapura (Mandasor). It contains 44 stanzas describing, in the *Gauḍī* style, the spring and winter and the city Daśapura. The inscription betrays Kālidāsa's influence, as it is composed in imitation of the *Meghasandeśa*.

Pravarasena is known as the author of a *Prākṛta* poem *Setubandha*, also called *Rāvaṇavadha* and *Daśamukhavadha*. In fifteen chapters called *āśvāsas*, the author describes the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* from Rāma's starting for Laṅkā up to his coronation in Ayodhyā. *Aśvāsas* 7, and 8 describe the consturction of the bridge, 9 describes *Suvela* and 11 is devoted to portray Rāvaṇa's love. The author displays his skill in *yamaka* in this work.[1] The poem has *anurāga* as its mark. It is held that this was written by Kālidāsa, at the instance of king Pravarasena of Kashmir, to commemorate the construction of a bridge of boats across the river Vitatsā now identified with Jhelum. This however is to be rejected since Bāṇa, who knows both Kālidāsa and Pravarasena, attributes the authorship of the poem to Parvarasena. The date of the work may be placed about 400 A.D. The work has won the appreciation of Bāṇa and Daṇḍin.[2]

कीर्तिः प्रवरसेनस्य प्रयाता कुमुदोज्ज्वला ।
सागरस्य परं पारं कपिसेनेव सेतुना ।।

Harṣacarita Introductory stanza 14

महाराष्ट्राश्रयां भाषां प्रकृष्टं प्राकृतं विदुः।
सागरः सूक्तिरत्नानां सेतुबन्धादि यन्मयम् ।।

Kāvyādarśa I 34

---

1. Cf.*Setubandha*- I26, III 45 to 48, VII 60
2. *Avantisundarī* Introductory stanza 13

The Buddhist writer Buddhaghoṣa is the author of a poem *Padyacūḍāmaṇi* in ten cantos describing the life of the Buddha. His work betrays the influence of Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa. According to the Buddhist sources, he was sent in 357 A.D. to bring from Ceylon a *Pāli* version of the commentaries on the *Tripiṭakas*. One of his works was translated in 488 A.D. into *Chinese*. The date of the work can be taken to be about 400 A.D.

Bhīma also known as Bhaumaka wrote his *Rāvaṇārjunīya* or *Arjunarāvaṇīya* in 27 cantos describing the battle between Rāvaṇa and Kārtavīryārjuna. It is mainly intended to illustrate the rules of grammar. Since this work is cited in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (C.550 A.D.), its date can be about 500 A.D.

Kumaradāsa is the author of the poem *Jānakīharaṇa* in twenty cantos. He is identified with a king of Ceylon of the same name (517-529 A.D.). He was born blind and was helped in getting his kingdom and in writing this poem by his two maternal uncles. He displays his skill in *śabdālaṅkāras e.g.*, *yamaka* in canto 17, *ślokas* in a single[1] and double consonants,[2] and other kinds of *bandha* like *muraja*,[3] *jāla*[4] etc. The poem is written in an easy flowing style and shows unmistakable evidences of Kālidāsa's influence.[5] It is not therefore surprising to find Kumāradāsa being praised by the rhetorician Rājaśekhara (900 A.D.) in the following stanza:—

जानकीहरणं कर्तुं रघुवंशे स्थिते सति ।
कविः कुमारदासश्च रावणश्च यदि क्षमः ।।

The date of Kum*ā*rad*ā*sa can be fixed about 520 A.D.

Bhāravi is the author of a *mahākāvya Kirātārjunīya* in 18 cantos describing the getting of the *Pāśupatāstra* by Arjuna. The poem does not begin with a benediction. The discussions on political issues in which Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma and Draupadī participate take the first two cantos which are noted for the vigour and depth of expression. The Himalayas, love sports of the *apsarasas* attempting to corrupt Arjuna and the fight between Arjuna and Śiva in disguise are described brilliantly with unrivalled skill. Both Śiva and Kumāra are shown here as opposing Arjuna.

Bhāravi's style is full of spirit and his language is pregnant with sense and would be the appropriate illustration for the definition of *śleṣa* as given by Daṇḍin.[6] Bhāravi exhibits his skill in the careful use of the rules of grammar. In the 15th canto, he displays his skill in playing with words. There are stanzas with a single[7] and double consonants,[1] reading the same when taken from both ends of the line,[2] and having the *bandha*[3]. It is said that 'he is in many ways the beginner of mannerisms in the later poets, but it seems that Kumāradāsa must have been the originator of this mannerism, as he lived about 520 A.D., before Bhāravi who was patronised by Siṁhaviṣṇu, the Pallava king of Kāñcī (575-600 A.D.). In admiration of his style and eminence as a poet, he came to be called छत्रभारवि on account of his fancied picture of the pollen risen in the air.[4] The commentator Mallinātha considers Bhāravi's words as a hard nut to crack.[5] Countless are the general statements in this poem all didactic in character.[6] The poem has the mark '*lakṣmī*.'

---

[1] *Jānakīharaṇa-* XVIII 47
[2] *Jānakīharṇaa* XVIII 6, 54
[3] ” ” 21
[4] ” ” 37 to 45
[5] ” I-41, IX-4, X-3, XX55 & IX (description of procession)
[6] *Kāvyādarśa* I-43
[7] *Kirātārjunīya* XV-14

Bhaṭṭi wrote a poem *Rāvaṇavadha* in Valabhī which was ruled by Śrīdharasena[7]. There were four kings with this name and Śrīdharasena IV, of whom there is an inscription dated 644 A.D.,[8] was a patron of letters and probably is referred to by Bhaṭṭi. The word '*bhaṭṭi*', which is the *Prākṛta* form of the *Saṁkṛta* word '*bhartṛ*,' led some scholars to identify Bhaṭṭi with the celebrated grammarian Bhartṛhari. This identification is sought to be strengthened by both, these having been grammarians. This cannot however be admitted, as Bhaṭṭi is known to have lived about 650 A.D., while Bhartṛhari lived about 400 A.D.

The poem *Rāvaṇavadha*, known as *Bhaṭṭikāvya* after the name of the author, describes the story of Rāma in 22 cantos. It primarily illustrates the rules of grammar and the figures of speech. Canto XIII can be read as a *Saṁskṛta* or *Prākṛta* poem. The figures of speech illustrated by Bhaṭṭi help very much in tracing the history of their evolution.

Māgha was the son of Dattaka and grandson of Śuprabhadeva, an officer under king Śrīvarmala. There is an inscription dated 625 A.D. about a king Varmalāta who was perhaps identical with Śrīvarmala. Māgha is mentioned by Ānandavardhana (850 A.D.), Nṛpatuṅga (850 A.D.) and Rājaśekhara (900 A.D.) His date may therefore be fixed about 700 A.D. Some scholars imagine that he was a Vaiśya or a Buddhist.

Māgha's poem *Śiśupālavadha* is a *Mahākāvya* in twenty cantos describing the slaying of Śiśupāla by Kṛṣṇa. The poem is modelled upon that of Bhāravi. Both do not begin with benediction but begin with the word श्रियः. Political discussions, mountain scenery, drinking parties, and battle-scene occur in the same order. Like Bhāravi, Māgha exhibits his skill in *śabdālaṅkaras*. There are stanzas with a single[1] and double consonants,[2] remaining the same when read from both ends of the line,[3] illustrating *yamaka*[4] and *bandha*.[5] Of these, the *cakrabandha* contains the names of the author and poem.[6] Māgha thus excelled Bhāravi by successfully imitating him and hence the following praise.

---

[1] *Kirātārjunīya* XV 38 [2] *Kirātārjunīya* XV 18, 22, 23
[3] " " 12 [4] ., V-39
[5] नारिकेलफलसंमितं वचोः भारवेः ।
[6] *Cf. Kirātārjunīya* II-30; IX 30, 64; XI 59
[7] *Rāvaṇavadha* XXII 35
[8] Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar Vol. III p. 228

तावद्भा भारवेर्भाति यावन्माघस्य नोदयः ।
उदिते तु पुनर्माघे भारवेर्भा रवेरिव ।।

Māgha's knowledge is very exhaustive and varied. He draws from all subjects possible for the effective presentation of the subject.[7] The poem contains graphic descriptions and pithy statements.[8] Māgha's comparison of the sun and moon on both the horizons to the bells suspended from the back of the elephant won for him the title घण्टामाघ[9]. His vocabulary is so rich that it is said that after reading nine cantos of his work, one cannot come across a new word.

नवसर्गगते माघे नवशब्दो न विद्यते ।

It is also said that Māgha combined in himself the excellences of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Daṇḍin.

उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेरर्थगौरवम् ।
दण्डिनः पदलालित्यं माघे सन्ति त्रयो गुणाः ।।

The poem has the mark *śrī*.

Vākpati is the author of a *Prākṛta* poem *Gauḍavaho* containing 1209 *ślokas*. The author intended to narrate the story of the slaying of a Gauḍa prince by the author's patron Yaśovarman of Kanauj. The poem however serves only as a preface to the intended theme. It abounds in invocations in honour of various deities, glory of poets and of the poet's patron Yaśovarman. There is only a casual reference to the king of Gauḍa country. The poem has an abrupt ending with Yaśovarman's victorious march. The date of the poem may be taken to be about 730 A.D. Yaśovarman was defeated in 733 A.D. by Lalitāditya of Kashmir. The author speaks of Bhavabhūti[10] in appreciative terms who too was patronised by Yaśovarman. Vākpati refers in this poem to his earlier work *Mahumahavijaya*[11] which is not extant. The commentator Haripālā renders this into *Madhumathavijaya*.

---

[1] *Śiśupālavadha* XIX 114
[2] Cf. *Śiśupālavadha* XIX 66, 84, 86
[3] Cf. ,, XIX 40, 88
[4] Cf. ,, VI 66-78
[5] Cf. ,, XIX *muraja* 29
[6] Cf. ,, XIX 120
[7] Cf. ,, II, V
[8] Cf. ,, XV 14, IV 17
[9] *Cf.* ,, IV 20
[10] Gauḍavaho 799
[11] Gauḍavaho 69

Haricandra is the author of the *Dharmaśarmābhyudaya* a poem in twenty-one cantos dealing with the life of the Jain saint Dharmanātha. He was influenced by Māgha and Vākpati and therefore could be placed about 800 A.D. Nītivarman's *Kīcakavadha* a poem in five cantos describes the death of Kīcaka at the hands of Bhīmasena. It abounds in alliteration and pun. As Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) refers to it, Nītivarman can be assigned to the ninth century.

The *Haravijaya*, a poem in fifty cantos, is the work of Ratnākara a protege in the court of Avantivarman (857-884 A.D.) of Kashmir. The author had the titles *Rājānaka*, *Vāgīśvara* and *Vidyādhipati*. The poem which contains four thousand ślokas deals with a very short theme of the slaying of the demon Andhaka by Śiva. The sole purpose in writing this poem, which is disproportionately long, seems to be an attempt to compose an ideal *mahākāvya*. The poem, having the mark "*ratna*', exhibits the author's skill in *śabdālaṅkāras*. In addition to the *yamaka*,[1] and other features noticed in the works of Bhāravi and Māgha, the author has framed *ślokas* in illustration of some *bandhas* not found in Māgha.[2] He has a *śloka* in the language of the *piśācas*[3] and another which can be read in six languages.[4] The poem is valuable for the information it contains on dancing. Ratnākara's skill in handling the *Vasantatilaka* metre is attested by Kṣemendra.

Śivasvāmin, better known as Bhaṭṭa Śivasvāmin, was patronised by Avantivarman of Kashmir and therefore was a contemporary of Ratnākara (C.850 A.D.)[5] His poem *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* in twenty cantos describes how a king of the South Kapphiṇa by name threatened to attack king Prasenajit of Śrāvasti but was converted into Buddhism by the latter. The author avails himself of the opportunity to deal with the matters that require to be treated in a *mahākāvya*. This poem, whose mark is śiva and which is dedicated to Śiva, is based on the *Avadānaśataka* of the Buddhists. The author calls himself as *Yamakakavi*, an imitator or follower of Kālidāsa and as one who had studied thoroughly the works of Meṇṭha.[6] Śivasvāmin displays his skill in the *śabdālaṅkāras* and *yamaka*.[7] A *śloka* admits of being read in six languages.[8] One full canto is written in *Prākṛta*.[9] In a *śloka*, words are used to match sense.[10]

Abhinanda, also called Gauḍābhinanda, the son of the logician Jayanta bhaṭṭa (C.880 A.D.) is the author of a poem *Kādambarīkathāsāra* in eight cantos being a summary of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*. Another

---

[1] Cf. Haravijaya III, XXIX, LIII, LVI

[2] ,, LIII—*Kāñcībandha*, *Tūṇībandha*, *śūlabandha etc.*

[3] ,, IV 26

[4] Cf. *Haravijaya* IV 35

[5] *Rājataraṅgiṇī* V 34

[6] *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* XX 47

[7] ,, VI, VIII, X, & XVIII

[8] ,, XVIII 128

[9] ,, XIX

[10] ,, VI 82

Abhinanda, son of Śatānanda of Kashmir wrote the poem *Rāmacarita* in 36 cantos beginning with the desciption of the rainy season in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* and ending with Rāma's coronation. The work was left incomplete. It was completed by two different writers who added four more cantos each, making the number of cantos forty in the poem. This work is cited by Mahimabhaṭṭa (C.1025 A.D.) and Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) and therefore, the author may be placed about 900 A.D. The Jain writer Dhanañjaya of the same period was responsible for writing the *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya*, a *dvisandhānakāvya* narrating the stories of Rāma and the Pāṇḍavas at the same time through the same composition. It appears that Daṇḍin, probably the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*, wrote a *dvisandhānakāvya* on the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* themes. On the life of Yaśodhara, a Jain king, was written a poem *Yaśodharacarita* in four canots by the Jain author Kanakasenavādirāj (C.950 A.D.). During the same period was written the *Kavirahasya* by Halāyudha who was patronised by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III (940-56 A.D.). This work illustrates the rules of grammar pertaining to the verbs and at the same time is in praise of the poet's patron.

Padmagupta also called Parimala or Parimalakālidāsa narrated the biography of his patron in a poem *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* in eighteen cantos. He was a poet under the Paramāra kings Muñja, Sindhurāja and Bhoja. The second mentioned king had the title *Navasāhasāṅka*. The poem glorifies this patron of the poet. It describes his hunting excursions and his marriage with Śaśiprabhā a *Nāga* princess.

Kṣemendra of Kashmir was a prolific writer of the first half of the 11th century A.D. He was the son of Prakāśendra and studied literature under Abhinavagupta. Through the favour of one Somapāda, he became an ardent devotee of Viṣṇu. He had the title *Vyāsadāsa*, as he received the blessings of the sage Vyāsa. He is the author of a number of abridgements of the epic-stories which he wrote at the request of a Brahmin Rāmayaśas. They are the *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* which includes the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, *Bhāratamañjarī*, and *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, an epitome of Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā*. His *Daśāvatāracarita*, the date of whose compostion is 1066 A.D., is a poem on the incarnations of Viṣṇu. *Bāṇa's Kādambarī* was rendered into verse by him in the *Padyakādambarī*. His other *kāvyas* are lost. Some among them are the *Śaśivaṁśamahākāvya* and the *Amṛtataraṅgakāvya* which are cited by him in his *Aucityavicāracarcā*.

Bilhaṇa of Kashmir was the son of Jyeṣṭhakalaśa. Completing his study, he left Kashmir about 1050 A.D. After considerable wandering, he settled about 1070 A.D. in the court of Trailokyamalla, the Cālūkya king who was ruling in Anhilvad. After a few years, he left that court and became the poet under Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇa. At about 1085 A.D. he wrote the poem *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* in eighteen cantos about the ancestry and life of his patron, his parton's hunting expedition and his marriage with Candralekhā a *Śilahāra* princess. In the last canto, he gives an account of his wanderings. Bilhaṇa is a master of graphic description and commands an elegant and smooth style. In this poem, he refers to a work of his on Rāma which is now lost.

Maṅkha, also known as Maṅkhaka, is the author of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*, a poem in twenty-five cantos describing the destruction of the three cites by Śiva. Much of what is contained there would declare the poem a *mahākāvya*. The whole of canto I is filled with the stanzas of benediction. The next canto describes good and bad people. The subject matter is begun in the next canto and goes on in the traditional *mahākāvya* fashion. In the last canto, the author gives an account of life in the court of his brother Laṅka also called Alaṅkāra, who was a minister of king Jayasiṁha of Kashmir (1129-51 A.D.). This canto refers to Rājaśekhara, Murāri and others who were his predecessors and to Kalhaṇa, Bilhaṇa and Jalhaṇa who were his contemporaries. Among the other scholars, mentioned by him, Loṣṭadeva was proficient in six languages and Śrīgarbha and Jinduka studied the works of Prabhākara. All the three brothers including Laṅka were men of letters and all these including Maṅkha held high positions in the state. Maṅkha was a pupil of Ruyyaka, the rhetorician of Kashmir. Maṅkha can therefore be assigned to a period about 1150 A.D.

In the year 1149 A.D. was begun the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, the historical poem in eight chapters, by Kalhaṇa. Kalhaṇa began to write in this poem the history of Kashmir from the early period and stopped with the reign of Jayasimha (1129-1151 A.D.), At about the same period was written by Jalhaṇa the *Somapālavilāsa*, a historical poem about king Somapāla who ruled at Rājapurī. The poem *Neminirvāṇa* in fifteen cantos was composed by Vāgbhaṭa (C. 1150 A.D.) in praise of the Jain saint Neminātha. To this period belongs the *Rāmapālacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin. This poem, which is of the *dvisandhāna* kind, gives the story of Rāma and at the same time glorifies the poet's patron Rāmapāla of Bengal (1104-1130 A.D.). In the same century did flourish Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka also called Bilvamaṅgala who wrote a number of works under different heads like poem, grammar, philosophy etc. Among those poems that which is well-known is the *Govindābhiṣeka* a Prākṛta poem in twelve cantos illustrating the rules of grammar. This is also called *Śrīcihnakāvya* glorifying his deity Kṛṣṇa.

Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.), who was styled as *Kalikālasarvajña*, was a prolific writer and Jain monk. He was a protege under Jayasiṁha and Kumārapāla of Anhilvad. The latter king became a Jain through the efforts of this monk and made Jainism the state religion. This writer is the author of two poems *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruśacarita* and *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. The former is in ten *parvans* describing the life of sixty-three men of the Jain faith. The latter narrates the life of Kumārapāla, the poet's patron and therefore is called *Kumārapālacarita*. It has twenty cantos in *Saṁskṛta* and eight in *Prākṛta* and so is called *Dvyāśrayakāvya*. At the same time, this poem illustrates the rules of *Sāṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta* grammars framed by the author himself.

Towards the close of the 12th century A.D., a poet Kavirāja by name was patronised by king Kāmadeva (1182-97 A.D.) of the Kādamba dynasty. The poet, who was the son of Kīrtinārāyaṇa, composed a *dvisandhānakāvya Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* in thirteen cantos. with *kāmadeva* as the mark. The author's justification for an attempt of this kind is clear from the following stanzas of the *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* :—

श्रीरामायणमाणिक्यं भारतस्वर्णमुद्रितम् ।
न कस्य कुरुते लोके विस्मयोल्लासि मानसम् ॥ I 35
श्रीमद्रामायणं गङ्गा भारतं सागरो महान् ।
तत्संयोजनकार्यज्ञौ कविराजभगीरथौ ॥ I 39

The following two stanzas show how talented Kavirāja is to be regarded as a composer of the *dvisandhānakāvya* :—

तद्वाक्यान्ते दत्तकर्णानुमोदः
पुत्रप्रीत्या जातकृच्छ्ः कुमारम् ।
धर्मात्मानं प्रेषयामास दूरं
विश्वामित्रप्रीतये भूमिपालः ॥ I 76
मात्रा समं सावरजः स राज्ञा
प्रस्थापितो धाम तपोधनानाम् ।
स्थानान्तरं विद्विषतां रणेषु
समर्थकोदण्डधरः प्रतस्थे ॥ I 77

He calls himself a master of *vakrokti* and places himself along with Bāṇa and Subandhu who are masters of *vakrokti*.

सुवन्धुर्वाणभट्टश्च कविराज इति त्रयम् ।
वक्रोक्तिमार्गनिपुणाश्चतुर्थो विद्यते न वा ॥ I 40

Kavirāja is the author of another poem *Pārijātaharaṇa* in ten cantos describing Kṛṣṇa's bringing the celestial tree *Pārijāta* down to the earth.

Śrīharṣa, the son of Hīra and Māmalladevī, was a reputed poet under the kings Vijayacandra and Jayacandra of Kanauj towards the close of the same century. He practised the *Cintāmaṇimantra* and attained proficiency in the various lores. His *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, a *mahākāvya* in twenty-two cantos, is an incomplete poem on the life of Nala and Damayantī. Śrīharṣa observes no limit for his descriptions. Each small incident is described in all its details. He chalks out a separate path for himself in regard to treatment of the incidents, employment of the figures of speech, delineation of sentiments and displaying his fancy and imagination[1]. He displays his erudition by drawing upon the branches of philosophy[2] and grammar[3] for purposes of effective representation of his poetic abilities. His work can therefore be styled as a *Śāstrakāvya*. His style is very terse and could not be easily understood even by the learned without the aid of the lexicon. Hence it is referred to as नषधं विद्वदौषधम् । Rarely does Śrīharṣa display his skill in *yamaka*. A *śloka* is composed in a manner to apply to Agni, Yama, Varuṇa, Nala and Indra.[1] The poem contains some interesting information. The bride's party takes the initiative in marriages.[2] Good men do not utter their own names.[3] On the occasion of the celebration of marriages, the entrance to the house is adorned with the plantain trees.[4] At the end of some of the cantos, Śrīharṣa refers to his other works. They are *Sthairyavicāraṇaprakaraṇa*, *Vijayapraśasti*, *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, *Gauḍorvīśakulapraśasti*, *Arṇavavarṇana*, *Cchindapraśasti*, *Śivaśaktisādhana* and a *campū Navasāhasāṅkacarita*. All these are lost except the third mentioned work.

---

[1] Cf. *Naiṣadhīyacarita* IV
[2] Cf. *Naiṣadhīyacarita* V 29
[3] Cf. *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, II 24

The victory achieved in 1191 A.D. by Pṛthvīrāja king of Ajmir and Delhi in a batlle with Sultan Shahbuddin Ghori was recorded in a poem *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* by Caṇḍakavi. The poem is in eight cantos and is incomplete. The date of the work may be fixed about 1200. The life of Nala is narrated by Kṛṣṇānanda of Pūri in his poem *Sahṛdayānanda* in fifteen cantos. This poem is written in an easy and elegant style. The date of the author may be taken to be about the beginning of the 13th century. At almost the same time, Jayaratha of Kashmir wrote the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* in thirty-two *prakāśas* describing the exploits of Śiva and the practises of the Kashmirian Śaivites. To the same period belongs Abhayadeva a Jain writer, who wrote in 1221 A.D. the poem *Jayantavijaya* in nineteen cantos about the life of Jayanta a king in the family of Vikramasiṁha.

Vastupāla was a minister of king Vīradhavala (C.1220 A.D.), a patron of learning. Vastupāla himself was a man of literary taste and had among others a number of poets as his friends. In 1222 A.D. Arisiṁha, who was patronised by him, wrote a poem *Sukṛtasaṅkīrtana* in eleven cantos on the genealogy of Vīradhavala and the charitable deeds of Vastupāla. Bālacandrasūri, an admirer of Vastupāla composed in 1240 A.D. a poem *Vasantavilāsa* in fourteen cantos[5] describing the achievements of Vastupāla. The glory of king Suratha of the *Caitra* race is treated by Someśvaradeva, a friend of Vastupāla in the *Surathotsava*, a poem in fifteen cantos. Amaracandra, who was patronised by Vastupāla, described the story of the *Mahābhārata* in the *Bālabhārata* a poem containing 44 cantos. It approaches Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa* by the grace and charm of the language and has *vīra* as its mark.

---

[1] Cf. *Naiṣadhīyacarita* XIII 34

[2] Cf. *Naiṣadhīyacarita* I 50

[3] ,, IX 13

[4] ,, XVI 8

[5] Canto VI has some *ślokas* marked by *yamaka*

About the same period, Devaprabhasūri described the life of the Pāṇḍavas in the *Pāṇḍavacarita* containing eighteen cantos. The author lays stress on the need of practising virtue. About the Jain saint Prabhāvaka, Candraprabhasūri wrote, in 1278 A.D., the *Prabhāvakacarita*. To the same period belongs Vīranandin who wrote the *Candraprabhacarita* in eighteen cantos narrating the lives of king Kanakaprabha and the Jain saint Candraprabha. The poem *Jagadūcarita* in seven cantos was composed about 1300 A.D. by Sarvānanda in praise of the help rendered by a pious Jain to the people in Gujarat during a famine which took place in 1256 A.D. The *Hammīramahākāvya* in fourteen cantos was composed by Nayacandra about 1310 A.D., describing how Hammira a king of the Chohan race gave protection to a Moghul nobleman from Allaudin for which act his capital was besieged by Allaudin and he was killed.

In the latter part of the thirteenth century A.D., Parameśvarabhaṭṭa of the Payyūr family in Kerala composed the *Haricarita* on the story of Kṛṣṇa. This poem consists of 253 stanzas, incorporating the *vākyas* at the beginning of each stanza. The *vākyas* are notations of numbers current in South India used for calculating the position of moon day after day. Thus this poem is unique in its kind. Agastya, a poet in the court of king Pratāparudradeva of Warangal (1294-1325 A.D.), is held to be the author of seventy-four poems and was conferred the title *Vidyānātha* by his patron. His *Bālabhārata* in twenty cantos deals with the life of the Pāṇḍavas employing an exceedingly graceful style.

Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.), whose original name was Veṅkaṭanātha, was a great poet and philosopher. He was a native of Kāñcī. His poem *Yādavābhyudaya* in twenty-four cantos narrates the story of Kṛṣṇa. The aerial view of the land is described in the eighteenth canto which describes the death of the demon Naraka at the hands of Kṛṣṇa and the latter's return to Dvārakā. The sixth canto[1], displaying the author's skill in the *Śabdālaṅkāras*, is in imitation of the works of Bhāravi and Māgha. The author, who composed about one hundred and twenty works on various subjects, was awarded the titles *Vedāntācārya*, *Kavitārkikasiṁha* and *Sarvatantrasvatantra*. The worth of this poem is heightened by the commentary written upon it by the prblific writer Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.).

Gaṅgādevī, wife of Kampana, the second son of Bukka I (1343-1379 A.D.) of the Vijayanagar empire, is credited with the authorship of a poem *Mathurāvijaya* also called *Vīrakamparāyacarita*. Kampana's expedition to the south and his slaying the ruler of Madurai are vividly described. The poem contains seven cantos. The date of the work may be fixed about 1380 A.D. About the same period, Lolambarāja, a poet under Harihara, described the life of Kṛṣṇa in the *Harivilāsa*, a poem in five cantos. At the beginning of the 15th century Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, son of Komaṭiyajvan of Vatsagotra, described Rama's life in the *Raghunāthābhyudaya* a poem in thirty cantos and Nala's story in the *Nalābhyudaya* a poem in eight cantos. He was patronised by Peddakomaṭi Vemabhūpāla (1403-1420 A.D.) of Addaṅki.

---

[1] *Yādavābhyudaya* VI अष्टदलपद्मबन्ध VI-105

Vāsudeva, son of Maharṣi and Gopālikā residents of Vedāraṇya in Kerala, was famous as a *Yamakakavi.* He is said to have composed twenty-one works on various subjects. Among them, the following are the important poems full of *yamaka* :—*Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya*, *Nalodaya*, *Saurikathā* and *Tripuradāha.* The first mentioned poem has eight *āśvāsas* and describes Yudhiṣṭhira's victory over the Kauravas. The second one deals in four *āśvāsas* with Nala's life after he got back his kingdom. The third one deals with Kṛṣṇa's life and the last one with the burning of the three cities by Śiva. The second work is wrongly attributed to Kālidāsa. Vāsudeva lived in the first half of the fifteenth century A.D.

Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī* was continued by Jonarāja (1450 A.D.) from the time of Jayasiṁha to that of Sultan Zainu-l-abidin. Jonarāja's pupil Śrīvara continued his master's work in his *Jainarājataraṅgiṇī* up to the period 1486 A.D. Prājyabhaṭṭa, a later writer, wrote the *Rājāvalīpatākā* in continuation of Srīvara's work up to the period when Kashmir was annexed by Akbar.

Sukumārakavi (C.1450 A.D.) of Kerala narrated the life of Kṛṣṇa in the *Kṛṣṇavilāsa* containing four cantos written in an attractive and elegant style. Rājanātha II, who had the title *Diṇḍimakavisārvabhauma* and a poet under the Vijayanagar kings, celebrated, about 1430 A.D., the achievements of Sāluvanarasiṁha the chief of the army of the Vijayanagar kings by writing the *Sāluvābhyudaya* in thirteen cantos. His grandson Rājanātha III described, about 1540 A.D., the exploits of king Acyutarāja (1530-1542 A.D.), the brother of Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagar in the *Acyutarāyābhyudaya* containing twenty cantos.

In 1542 A.D., Rāmacandra, son of Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa, composed a *dvisandhānakāvya* in 130 *ślokas* giving the erotic sense and at the same time extolling asceticism. How Śiva went forth as a beggar before the Cola king whose liberality He desired to test is described in the poem *Bhikṣāṭanakāvya* which is incomplete and is divided into thirty-nine chapters called *paddhatis.* The name of the author is not known. The word *śivabhaktidāsa* which occurs in the poem could have been his title as also the name Utprekṣāvallabha which proclaims the author's flights of fancy. The author is said to have hailed from Kerala and is placed in the 16th century A.D. Rudrakavi composed the *Rāṣṭrauḍhavaṁśamahākāvya* in twenty cantos narrating the history of the family of Nārāyanshah the ruler of Mayūragiri who was his patron. The author starts the story from the first king Rāṣṭrauḍha. The date of the poem is 1596 A.D.

About 1600 A.D., a *trisandhānakāvya* called *Rāghavapāṇḍayādavīya* was composed by Cidambara. The life of king Raghunātha, the Nāyak king of Tanjore is narrated by Yajñanārāyaṇa, son of Govindadīkṣita, in the *Raghunāthabhūpavijaya* also called *Sāhityaratnākara* in sixteen cantos. The author must have lived about 1620 A.D. when Raghunātha Nāyak was the ruler. On the same theme and during the same period was written the *Raghunāthābhyudaya* in twelve cantos by Rāmabhadrāmbā, the queen of Raghunātha Nāyak. Under the patronage of the same king, Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita, son of Ratnakheṭa Śrīnivāsadīkṣita, a contemporary of Appayadīkṣita (C.1600 A.D.), wrote the elegant poem *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa* in ten cantos.

Under the patronage of Tirumala Nāyak of Madurai, Cakrakavi composed the *Jānakīpariṇaya* in eight cantos. He lived about 1650 A.D., when his contemporary Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita, grandson of the brother of Appayadīkṣita (C.1600 A.D.) wrote the *Sivalīlārṇava* and *Gaṅgāvatarana*. The former which is in twenty-two cantos describes Śiva's exploits. The latter is in eight cantos describing the descent of Gaṅgā. The author was born in 1613 A.D. and was the minister of Tirumala Nāyak. He condemns the poets taking delight in the *śabdālaṅkāras*.[1]

To the same period belongs Veṅkaṭādhvarin, a resident of Kāñcī. He is said to have written a *dvisandhānakāvya* named *Yādavarāghavīya* in thirty stanzas. In 1671 A.D., a Jain monk named Meghavijayagaṇi composed the *Saptasandhānamahākāvya* glorifying Vṛṣabhanātha, Śāntinātha, Pārśvanātha, Neminātha, Mahāvīrasvāmin, Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva. His other poems *Devānandābhyudaya* and *Śāntināthacarita* have, in them, some of the verses of the *Śiśupālavadha* and the *Naisadhīyacarita* respectively incorporated. At about the same time, the Jain Devavimalagaṇi composed the *Hīrasaubhāgya* in seventeen cantos and himself commented on it. It describes the life of Hīravijayasūri, who was awarded the title *Jagadguru* by Akbar.

Under the patronage of king Shahaji of Tanjore (1684-1711 A.D.), Rāmabhadradīkṣita described the life of the grammarian Patañjali in the *Patañjalicarita* a poem in eight cantos. To the same period belong the *Rāmakathā* of Vāsudeva and the *Rukmiṇīsvayaṁvara* of Rāmavarma Parīkṣit.

In the eighteenth century, the Kerala poet Rāmapāṇivāda wrote two *Prākṛta* poems *Uṣāṇiruddho* and *Kaṁsavaho* on the epic, themes. Both the works contain four cantos each. The word *pāṇivāda* means one who plays with the hand, that is, one who plays on the *mṛdaṅga*, the musical instrument. The author must have belonged to the family of drummers. During the same period, a *dvisandhānakāvya* was written with the name *Rāghavanaiṣadhīya* by Haradattasūri.

The period of the *kāvya* literature has a rich development. The period before Kālidāsa attached more importance to sense than to the form of the compostion. This helped very much the creative faculty of the poets. Sense and form received equal and due attention in the period when Kālidāsa flourished. Poets distinguished themselves in establishing a sort of harmony between sound and sense.

---

[1] *Śivalīlārṇava* I 39

The period after Kālidāsa has many characteristic features. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana and the works on rhetorics exerted much influence on the poets during this period. The result has been the introduction of conventionalism in the mode of treatment of the subject matter. This of course took place gradually. The poets had to satisfy their patrons and a cultured audience. They had to satisfy the expert critics, sometimes fastidious also. There was thus no scope for the poets to display their creative faculty. More and more importance came to be attached to the form of the poem. Matter therefore had to be given secondary importance. This was made possible at the sacrifice of sense. The poets began to compete with each other in displaying their originality in form.

The writers of the West have described that the history " of the epic, in fact, is one of decline in taste and growing artificiality of form."[1] They refer to the *kāvyas* as artificial epic poetry. It must however be remembered that the word artificial is vague in its usage here. If the form or the poem had been artificial at a particular period, then it would have been ignored by the critics of that time. It was considered natural at that time. The poets had to adopt a way of writing prevalent and accepted by the critics of the time.

As a result of the rules laid down for the writing of a *mahākāvya*, the poets had to force certain matters in their poems to make them deserve the name *Mahākāvya*. Ratnākara's *Haravijaya*, Śivasvāmin's *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* and Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* prove this tendency. Displaying one's skill in the use of the *śabdālaṅkāras* created a sort of rivalry among the poets. This is illustrated by the *Jānakīharaṇa*, *Kirātārjunīya*, Si*śupālavadha*, *Haravijaya*, *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*, the works of the *Yamakakavi* Vāsudeva and others. The growing influence of the grammarians is felt in the *Buddhacarita*, *Saundarananda* and *Kirātārjunīya*. Some poets composed their works for the sole purpose of illustrating the rules of grammar. Bhīma, Bhaṭṭi, Hālāyudha and others deserve mention in this connection. As the poems became more and more formative, some writers like Śrīharṣa displayed their skill in fields other than poetry so as to heighten the artistic effect of the poem. A new tendency in the use of pun arose resulting in the writing of the *dvisandhāna* and *trisandhāna kāvyas*. It is aptly remarked that the puns "have a fatal effect on language; if a double sense is to be expressed, it is impossible for the best of poets to avoid straining meanings, constructions, and word order. The effort leads to constant ransacking of the poetical lexicons extant and turns the pursuit of poetry into an intellectual exercise of no high value to the utter ruin of emotion and thought."[2] The *dvisandhāna* and other kinds of the *kāvyas* of Rāmacandra, Cidambara,

---

[1] A.B. Keith : Classical Sanskrit Literature (Heritage of India Series). p. 47

[2] A. B. Keith : History of Sanskrit Literature p. 127

Meghavijayagaṇi and Haradattasūri could be cited here. The remark mentioned above does not apply to Kavirāja's work which is far simpler to other compositions of this type. Some poems were written for the main purpose of preaching religion *e.g.*, works of Aśvaghoṣa, Hemacandra and others. Matters of historical importance came to be treated in the works of some poets *e.g*,, works of Padmagupta, Bilhaṇa, Kalhaṇa and of the poets of the Vijayanagar period. The *Prākṛta* language had rich development at the hands of certain poets like Vākpati, Pravarasena, Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka, Rāmapāṇivāda and others.

North India has been a strong hold for poets. South India gained importance through the poets during the periods of the *Andhrābhṛtyas*, kings of Valabhī and others. Countless Jain poets flourished in Gujarat for nearly three centuries from about the tenth century. These poets had an attraction for the stories of the *Mahābhārata*. In the regions to the south of Deccan, poets began to flourish in the courts of the Pallavas from about 600 A.D. From this period up to recent times, there have been innumerable poets in these regions. These poets flourished under the patronage of the *Cālukyas*, *Ceras*, *Colas*, *Pāṇḍyas*, kings of Vijayanagar, Tanjore, Madurai and Malabar. Many of these patrons were themselves poets of high merit and composed a number of poems. Till the advent of the British in India, the princes had patronised the men of letters. Literary pursuits were not encouraged on the waning away of the princely order. Talent is not wanting but patronage is conspicuous by its absence even after India has regained her independence.

CHAPTER XIV

LYRICS

Omit

The word lyric is related to the word lyre which means an instrument of music in the Western countries. It is therefore taken to mean a literary piece which is sung to the accompaniment of a lyre. A lyric can therefore be an expression of a feeling, thought or sentiment whether it be of love, grief or devotion. It is an outpouring of the human heart. Its expression is spontaneous and it has an emotional appeal, more emotional than a poem. In the *Saṁskṛta* literature, the lyrics are not of considerable length. In size, they vary from one stanza to a work containing a number of stanzas. What is expressed in a lyrical piece is complete in itself. The animals and plants play a prominent part in the lyrics. The author of the lyrics draws instances for comparison from the *cakora*, *cātaka*, *cakravāka* and other birds and from the lotus, creepers and other plants. The lyrics are called *Khaṇḍakāvya* as they are in form *kāvyas* though not in the full sense of the *mahākāvya*. The *Saṁskṛta* lyrics have influenced Heinrich Heine, a German poet of the first half of the 19th century in writing a lyric *Auf Flūgeln des Gesanges*.

The origin of the lyrical compositions can be traced to the Vedic period. Vālmīki's utterance of the curse can be styled a lyric. Two main divisions are made in the lyrical literature viz., erotic and devotional.

EROTIC LYRICS

The lyrical compostions of the erotic type are available in various froms. Among them, the *sandeśa* type is one of the best in use. Here the lover, who is separated from the beloved, sends a message of love to her. The message is sent through a messenger whom the lover is in a mood to choose. Sometimes, the beloved too sends a message to her lover.

Among the *sandeśakāvyas*, the *Meghasandeśa* of Kālidāsa is the best. It is also called *Meghadūta*. It is of two parts. In the first part, it is stated how a Yakṣa, exiled in the Rāmagiri away from Alakā where lived his wife, felt a longing on seeing a cloud. He sends a message to his wife through the cloud. The cloud is asked to take a particular course to reach Alakā. The poet describes the places lying in the route. In the second part are described the city of Alakā, the abode of the Yakṣa, the condition of the Yakṣa's wife and the message.

It is held that Kālidāsa wrote this poem only to strike a personal note. He was sent as an ambassador to the court of Kuntaleśa by Vikramāditya. He chose to express, through this poem, his personal feelings of separation from his family. Whether there is truth or not in this, it is clear that Kālidāsa owed his theme to the *Rāmāyaṇa*,[1] Nala's story and the message which Rukmiṇī sent to Kṛṣṇa through the Brahmin.

The poet has well displayed his powers of description of natural sceneries.[2] He chose the *Mandākrāntā* metre which is said to fit in with the theme.

Vide :—प्रावृट्प्रवासव्यसने मन्दाक्रान्ता विराजते ।

He is said to have handled this metre with extraordinary elegance.[3] The poem contains 115 stanzas. There is no unanimity of opinion regarding this number.[4]

The *Meghasandeśa* has won universal admiration. It has influenced the poets of the West. Schiller (C.1800 A.D.) the German poet has, on the model of Kālidāsa's lyric, composed his *Maria Stuart* in which the captive queen of the Scots bids the clouds greet the land of France where she spent her youth.

The influence of the *Meghasandeśa* on later poets is very great. It served as the model for imitation of its form and theme. One kind of this imitation was to compose the stanzas incorporating one or more lines from the *Meghasandeśa*. Through this attempt the text of Meghasandeśa came to be preserved. Jinasena (C. 814 A.D.) wrote the *Pārśvābhyudaya* in four cantos describing the life of a Jain saint Pārśvanātha. This work preserves 120 stanzas of the *Meghasandeśa*. Vikrama of unknown date composed the *Nemidūta* on the life of the Jain saint Neminātha. This work has preserved 125 stanzas.

The other kind at imitation was to have the form of the lyric for a similar or different purpose. Dhoyī was one of the six eminent poets in the court of king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C. 1170 A.D.) the other five being Umāpatidhara, Jayadeva, Śaraṇa, Govardhana and Śrutidhara.[5] He wrote the *Pavanadūta* describing the love message sent to king Lakṣmaṇasena by a Gandharva maiden Kuvalayavatī. It contains 104 stanzas. It describes a city called Yayātinagarī on the river Mahānadī. Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.) wrote the *Haṁsasandeśa* in imitation of the *Meghasandeśa*. Rāma sends a message to Sītā through a swan after Hanumān's return from Laṅkā. Along with the element of love, the devotional element characterises this lyric. About 1400 A.D., three *Sandeśa kāvyas* were written by

---

[1] *Cf. Meghasandeśa Uttaramegha* — *Rāmāyaṇa Sundarakāṇḍa*

Stanza	37.	canto XXII 17 & 18
,,	36&38	,, LIII 2
,,	48	,,XVIII(*Kākāsura* incident) XX

[2] *Cf. Meghasandeśa Pūrvamegha* 49, 53, 62, 66.

[3] सुवशा कालिदासस्य मन्दाक्रान्ता प्रवल्गति । *Suvṛttatilaka* III 33

[4] Mallinātha has 121 stanzas,
Daksiṇāvartanātha 110, Pūrṇasarasvatī 110
Bharatasena 114, and Vallabhadeva 111.

[5] Śrutadhara is considered to be the title of Dhoyī by the commentator of the *Gītagovinda*.

by Uddaṇḍa, Udaya and Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, their works being *Kokilasandeśa*, *Mayūrasandeśa* and *Haṁsasandeśa* respectively. The *Haṁsadūta* and *Uddhavasandeśa* laying stress on the devotional aspect of love were composed by Rūpagosvāmin (C.1500 A.D.), the pupil of Kṛṣṇacaitanya. Pūrṇasarasvatī, the commentator on the *Meghasandeśa*, wrote the *Haṁsasandeśa* in which a woman of Kāñcī sends a message to Srikṛṣṇa at Bṛndāvana. As a sequel to this work, Parameśvara of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭa family composed the *Cakorasandeśa*. In the year 1705 A.D., Śatāvadhānakavi Śrikṛṣṇadeva made a gopī send a message to Kṛṣṇa in the *Bhṛṅgadūta*. Rāma śāstrin of Mysore (19th century A.D.) composed the *Meghapratisandeśa* describing the message sent by the Yakṣa's wife in reply to her husband's message. Some of these kāvyas contain more than two hundred stanzas *e.g.*, *Kokasandeśa* of Viṣṇutrātā (16th century A.D.), and *Bhṛṅgasandeśa* of Vāsudeva (17th century A.D.). Some among them are composed in metres other than the *Mandākrāntā*. The *Candradūta* of Vinayaprabha (before 1300 A.D.) is composed in *Mālinī*, the *Manodūta* of Viṣṇudāsa of unknown date in *Vasantatilaka* and the *Manodūta* of Rāmārāma of unknown date in *Śikhariṇī*.

Ghaṭakarpara is the author of the *Ghaṭakarpara kāvya* in twenty-two stanzas containing the message of a young wife sent to her lover through a cloud. This abounds in *yamaka*. The author avows to carry water in a broken jar to the man who would excel him by producing a superior work and hence the title of the work and perhaps of the author also. Some attribute this to Kālidāsa.[1]

Among the non-*sandeśa* kind of lyrics, the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* deserves mention. It is a lyric containing 144 stanzas describing the six seasons of the year in six cantos. The opinion of the scholars is divided about its authorship. The Indian scholars deny its authorship to Kālidāsa which is maintained by the Western scholars and some Indian scholars on the following grounds. The Indian commentators have ignored this work. The rhetoricians have not cited a single line from this work. On the contrary, the scholars of the West contend that the comparative simplicity of the work accounts for the absence of a commentary on it and that the rhetoricians 'nerver exhibit the slightest trace of liking for what is simple.' They further hold that 'if the poem were denied him, his reputation would suffer real loss.' It is true that this poem contains traces reminding us of Kālidāsa's authorship but an admission of this on this ground would lead to a similar admission of Kālidāsa's authorship for several other works of doutbful and undecided authorship. The passage सोऽ यं वो वितरीतरीतु वितनुर्भद्रं वमन्ताभिध :।(*Ṛtusaṁhāra* VI 28), which is un-Kālidāsan, does not favour Kālidāsa's authorship for this poem.

The *Śṛṅgāratilaka* is a lyric in thirty-one stanzas describing the phases of love. On the same theme is the *Puṣpabāṇavilāsa* in twenty-six stanzas. The *Rākṣasakāvya* is a lyric in twenty stanzas describing the forest sites through a lover roaming about with his beloved. All these are attributed to Kālidāsa's authorship.

---

[1] Abhinavagupta: A Historical and Philosophical Study by K.C. Pandey p. 65

Amaru or Amaruka is the author of a lyric *Amaruśataka* containing one hundred elegant stanzas on the various phases of love. The delineation of the various aspects of love is very realistic and highly imaginative. It is quoted by Vāmana (800 A.D.) and Ānandavardhana (850 A.D.). Its date can be fixed before 800 A.D. Its authorship is wrongly ascribed to Śaṅkara, the great exponent of Advaita.Bhartṛhari is the author of the *Śṛṅgāraśataka* containing one hundred stanzas on love. According to the author, love is not the final object of human pursuit. He is identified with the grammarian Bhartṛhari and sometimes with Bhartrhari the half brother of one Vikramāditya, which however lack confirmation. Bilhaṇa (1080 A.D., the author of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, composed the *Caurapañcāśikā* in fifty stanzas. It is said that the author was in love with the daughter of his patron who, scenting the guilt of the poet, ordered the poet to be hanged and that the poet composed this lyric while being lead away in the presence of his patron who was moved by the genuine pathos contained in this lyric and ordered the poet to be released. The lyric is in the form of the lover's recollections of the pleasures he had in the company of his beloved.

Jayadeva was the protege of king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C.1169 A.D.). He is the author of a lyric *Gītagovinda* in twelve cantos. He was born in Kindubilva[1] a place in Orisa. The cantos are named after the treatment of the hero in each of them, *e.g.*, अक्लेशकेशव, मुग्धमधुसूदन, नागरनारायण, सानन्ददामोदर etc. The poem describes the love of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā in the form of conversation between Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and the latter's companion. In some places, it becomes a lyrical monologue. The stanzas are grouped into sets, each containing eight stanzas. Hence the name of the work as *Aṣṭapadī*. The musical notes are given for each set which is to be sung. 'The recitative and the song, narrative, description and speeches are cunningly interwoven, all with deliberate purpose. The poem is said to represent the stage of transition between pure drama and pure lyric. It touches all the phases of love. The Indian commentators give an allegorical interpretation to the love aspect of the lyric. Kṛṣṇa stands for the Supreme Being, and Rādhā for the individual soul. The poem treats of the relationship of husband and wife (*nāyakanāyikābhāva*) as existing between God and the souls. Though primarily erotic in significance, this interpretation has turned the import to one of deep devotion and thus has made it very popular. It has numberless ardent admirers all over the country and is sung on occasions of worship. The Rādhākṛṣṇa form of worship owes much of its popularity to this lyric. Although its value as a devotional lyric cannot be minimised, its value as an erotic lyric is greater. It has a German translation by Rūckert.

---

1. *Gītagovinda* III-10

The *Śṛṅgārakallola* of Rāyabhaṭṭa (before 1600 A.D.) is similar to the *Amaruśataka* in matter and treatment.

DEVOTIONAL LYRICS

The religious lyrics form an important part of the lyrical literature. More than the literature in other branches, these have a wider appeal and have been greatly responsible in keeping the fire of religion from waning. The spiritual progress made by the various religions in India has been mainly due to them. Their purpose has been to wean the human mind from material attraction with which it is familiar for ages and to direct it in the path of wisdom and devotion to the Supereme Being. These lyrics, which are also philosophical in outlook, are in the form of sets of stanzas *e.g.*, *pañcaka*, *aṣṭaka*, *daśaka*, *pañcāśat*, *śataka* and so on. Most of them are metrical. Some are *daṇḍakas* in prose-form with a musical setting. Some are *gadyas* in prose-form and set to music. Their origin may be traced to the Vedic and the epic periods. Countless are these lyrics whose authorship is not decided in some cases.

To Kālidāsa's authorship are attributed some of the lyrics of which the *Śyāmalādaṇḍaka* is well-known. Aśvaghoṣa, the author of the *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda*, wrote the *Gaṇḍīstotragāthā* containing the religious message conveyed by the striking of a long piece of wood with a short club. The *Kalyāṇamandirastotra* was written by the Jain philosopher *Siddhasenadivākara* (C.500 A.D.) in praise of the *Tīrthaṁkaras*. To king Harṣa's (606-648 A.D.) authorship are attributed the *Suprabhātastotra* and the *Aṣṭamahāśrīcaityastotra* both Buddhistic in spirit. In praise of Caṇḍī, an aspect of Pārvatī, did Bāṇa (C.650 A.D.), the famous prose writer, compose the *Caṇḍīśataka*. Mānatuṅga, a contemporary of Bāṇa, wrote the *Bhaktāmarastotra* in praise of gods. At the same period did Mayūra, a poet in the court of king Harṣa and related to Bāṇa, compose the *Sūryaśataka* in praise of the sun thereby getting relief from his illness. One *Sarvajñamitra* (C. 750 A.D.) praised, in the *Sragdharāstotra*, Tārā the favourite deity of the theistic school of *Buddhism*.

A number of religious lyrics, noted for the elegance of style and devotional fervour, is attributed to Śaṅkarācārya, (632-664 A.D) the great exponent of Advaita.[1] The authorship of all these to Śaṅkara is not admitted by modern scholars, as in their opinion, some of them could have been composed by some heads of the Mutts established by Śaṅkara who also had the title Śaṅkarācārya. Some among the well-known lyrics of Śaṅkara are *Annapūrṇādaśaka*, *Kanakadhārāstava*, *Dakiṣṇāmūrtyaṣṭaka*, *Rāmabhujaṅgastotra*,[2] *Lakṣmīnṛsiṁhastotra*, *Viṣṇupādādikeṣāntavarṇana*, *Śivabhujaṅgastotra*, *Śivānandalaharī* and *Saundaryalaharī*.

---

[1] Some scholars are of opinion that the correct date of Saṅkara is in the period 632-664 A.D. Introduction of the *Brahmasiddhi* of Maṇḍanamisra.

[2] *Bhujaṅga* stands for the *bhujaṅgaprayāta* metre in which the *ślokas* here are composed.

The *Mukundamālā* is a lyric in praise of Viṣṇu by Kulaśekhara, king of Kerala. His identity with the Vaiṣṇavite saint Kulaśekhara Ālvar is disputed. The devotional element gets great stress in this lyric written in a chaste, direct and markedly simple style. The date of the work is assigned to 700 A.D. Mūka, who was born dumb, got the power of speech, by worshipping Kāmākṣī of Kāñcī and utilised it by singing the praise of that deity in the *Mūkapañcāśatī*. This writer flourished about 800 A.D., when Puṣpadanta of Kashmir sang the praise of Śiva in the *Mahimnastava*. About 850 A.D., did Ratnākara, the author of the *Haravijaya*, compose, by employing *vakrokti*, the *Vakroktipañcāśikā*. The author's ingenuity in this art is revealed in all the fifty stanzas contained in the lyric.

Vide :—त्वं हालाहलभृत्करोषि मनसो मूर्च्छां ममालिंगितो
हालां नैव विभर्मि नैव हलं मुग्धे कथं हालिकः ।
सत्यं हालिकतैव ते समुचिता सक्तस्य गोवाहने
वक्रोक्त्येति जितो हिमाद्रिसुतया स्मेरो हरः
पातु वः ॥
Śloka 2.

The *Devīśataka*, in praise of Pārvatī, written in a melodious style and abounding in the *śabdālaṅkāras*, is the work of the rhetorician Ānandavardhana who was patronised by Avantivarman of Kashmir (C.850 A.D.). A collection of hymns with the name *Stotrāvalī* in praise of Śiva is from the pen of Utpaladeva (C. 925 A. D.), the preceptor of the philosopher and rhetorician Abhinavagupta.

Yāmuna (C. 1000 A.D.), the great exponent of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* Vedānta, composed the *Catuśślokī* and the *Stotraratna* in praise of Lakṣmī and Viṣṇu respectively. The *Gadyatraya* comprising the *Śaraṇāgatigadya*, *Vaikuṇṭhagadya* and *Śrīraṅgagadya* is from the pen of Rāmānuja (1017-1137) A.D.), the greatest exponent of *Viśiṣṭadvaita*. The *Pañcastava* of Śrīvatsāṅka, a prominent disciple of Rāmānuja, comprises the *Śrīstava*, *Atimānuṣastava*, *Varadarājastava*, *Sundarabāhustava* and *Vaikuṇṭhastava* which reveal the author's fancy and imagination. Of equally great charm are the *Śrīguṇaratnakośa* and *Srīraṅgarājastava* which were composed by Parāśarabhaṭṭa, the talented son of Śrīvatsāṅka.

The *Gaṅgāstava* is the devotional lyric from the pen of Jayadeva (C.1200 A.D.), the author of the *Gītagovinda*. The *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* in praise of Kṛṣṇa is the composition of Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka, the author of the *Śrīcihnakāvya*. It contains 310 stanzas and gives vivid pictures of the sports of Kṛṣṇa. The erotic element here is not so pronounced as in the *Gītagovinda*. This lyric is widely popular throughout the land. The date of the work may be fixed in the twelfth century A.D. The *Dvādaśastotra* is a well-known lyric among the devotional poems of Ānandatīrtha popularly known as Madhva (1199-1277 A.D.).

Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.) is the the author of twenty-five lyrics. Among them, the *Pādukāsahasra*, written in one thousand stanzas in praise of Śrī Rāma's sandals, is supposed to have been written by the author in a single night to meet the challenge from a rival. It is a fine product of the poet's flights of fancy. In praise of Garuḍa was written the *Garuḍadaṇḍaka*. The whole incident of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is narrated in the *Raghuvīragadya*. The *Acyutaśataka* in praise of Viṣṇu was composed in *Prākṛta*. The other lyrics, though smaller in size, are characterised by the loftiness of sentiment and expression. His *Varadarājapañcāśat*, in praise of the deity at Kāñcī, was imitated zealously by Appayadīkṣita (C.1600 A.D.) in the *Varadarājastava* with his own commentary written in praise of the same deity.

Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa of Kerala was an inspired poet and versatile scholar of the latter half of the 16th century A.D. In 1585 A.D. he wrote the *Nārāyaṇīya* in praise of Kṛṣṇa. It is in the form of a summary of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. It has 1036 verses in twelve *skandhas*. It is held in great veneration in Malabar and is used for daily recitation. The great Advaita scholar Madhusūdanasarasvatī, who lived about 1600 A.D., composed the *Ānandamandākinī* describing Kṛṣṇa from foot to head. The *Gandharvaprārthanāṣṭaka* and the *Mukundamuktāvalī* are the lyrics composed by Rūpagosvāmin, the pupil of Kṛṣṇa Caitanya. Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1590-1665 A.D.), a protege of Shah Jehan, is the author of five lyrics with the names *Sudhālaharī*, *Amṛtalaharī*, *Lakṣmīlaharī*, *Karuṇālaharī* and *Gaṅgālaharī*. The *Sudhālaharī* has thirty stanzas in praise of the sun, *Amṛtalaharī* ten stanzas praising the river Yamunā, *Lakṣmīlaharī* forty-one stanzas in praise of Lakṣmī, *Karuṇālaharī* which is also known as *Viṣṇulaharī* sixty stanzas in praise of Viṣṇu and *Gaṅgālaharī* which is also known as *Pīyūṣalaharī* fifty-two stanzas in praise of the river Gaṅgā. Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (C.1650 A.D.), the author of the *Śivalīlārṇava*, is the author of two lyrics *Ānandasāgarastava* and *Śivotkarṣamañjarī* respectively on the state of bliss attained by one through his devotion to Pārvatī and on the eminence of Śiva as the Supreme Deity. To the same period belongs the terse *Lakṣmīsahasra* in praise of Lakṣmī and Viṣṇu by Venkaṭādhvarin. Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita (1700 A.D.), reputed for his devotion to Śrī Rāma, celebrated the powers of Rāma's arrows and the greatness of Sītā and Rāma through the *Rāmabāṇastava* and *Adbhutasītārāmastotra* respectively. The sports of Śrī Kṛṣṇa were sung by Nārāyaṇatīrtha in his *Kṛṣṇalīlātaraṅgiṇī* which is sung to various tunes in devotional gatherings. Noted for the depth of feeling, sincerity of devotion and melody in expression are the compositions of Tyāgarāja, Muthusvāmi Dīkṣita and Syāma Śāstrin of the last century.

CHAPTER XV

GNOMIC AND DIDACTIC POETRY

The gnomes are short pithy maxims on morals. These are based on the facts of general truth drawn from experience. Generally they deal with the rules of conduct. The didactic poems are intended for giving instructions. However there is no clear line of demarcation between gnomic and didactic poetry. A work supposed to be didactic contains the features of the gnomic poetry and vice-versa.

This type of poetry has been in existence from very early times. Influence of religion and philosophy is found in the growth and developement of this poetry. The sufferings of the soul, due to series of births and deaths, gave rise to the desire for the search after truth. Pain and pleasure were studied in all their aspects and their place in life came to be determined. The values of virtue and vice were taken into account while pursuing the path of progress. Stress is laid on the good and bad aspects of life and on the good and bad who influence, not in a small measure, the life of the people. Therefore the nature of good and bad conducts is given with illustrations. These poems, therefore, extol the need for the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood. Love of mankind is to be extended to the beasts and birds also.

Vide :—निर्गुणेष्वपि सत्त्वेषु दयां कुर्वन्ति साधवः ।
न हि संहरते ज्योत्स्नां चन्द्रश्चण्डालवेश्मनः ।।

Detachment and asceticism are praised. Instances for instructing these principles are freely drawn from the human and animal worlds. True friendship, chaste women and self-sacrifices receive good treatment at the hands of the writers of this type of poetry. On the other hand, what is conducive to the development of vice is condemned in a downright manner. Pedantry and spurious learning are condemned. The defects of misery and poverty together with their adverse effects on men and their life are duly recognised and recorded. The inscrutable ways of fate are clearly shown and illustrated, but human endeavour, it is held, must rise up to the occasion as the necessary complement of fate.

Vide :—उद्यमेन हि सिध्यन्ति कार्याणि न मनोरथैः ।
न हि सुप्तस्य सिंहस्य निपतन्ति मुखे मृगाः ।।

The subjects dealt within this branch belong therefore to the spheres of religion, philosophy, morals and politics. The Hindus, Buddhists and Jains have contributed to enrich this poetry in form, beauty and quality. Hence this can be called ethical poetry.

Like the lyrics, this also is of different forms. The stanzas are metrical and the size of this branch of poetry ranges from one stanza to a work containing a number of stanzas. Some among these have been handed down without being recorded in any particular work. The result of this kind of growth of this poetry was the inclusion of stray stanzas into definite text-books. The authors of these stanzas are not generally known. One and the same stanza is found sometimes included in more than one work.

The origin of this poetry may be traced to the *Ṛgveda* and the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa*. The *Mahābhārata* is rich in the collection of stanzas of this type. The earliest collection of such verses goes by the name of *Cāṇakyaśataka* containing 340 stanzas. The rules of conduct are dealt with in a general way. It is not known whether Cāṇakya, the author of the *Arthaśāstra*, is the author of this work. The *Rājanītisamuccaya* and *Vṛddhacāṇakya* and other works are similar to this. The *Dhammapāda* represents the attempt of the Buddhists at the composition of this poetry for the use of men of their faith.

The earliest text about which authentic information is available is the *Nītidviṣaṣṭikā* of Sundarapāṇḍya. The verses from this work are quoted in the anthologies without mentioning the source. Janāśraya (600 A. D.) quotes a line from this work in his *Chandoviciti*[1]. Kumārila[2] (C. 650 A. D.) and *Śaṅkarācārya*[3] cite Sundarapāṇḍya's passages but the texts from which they must have been taken are now lost. He must have been a native of Madurai. His date may be fixed about 500 A.D. Śāntideva's (C. 600 A.D.) *Bodhicaryāvatāra* enumerates the duties of a *bodhisattva*. Stress is laid on the value of love for mankind. The popularity of the work is evident from the number of commentaries available on it. In a similar strain are written the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sūtrasamuccaya* by the same author. Bhartṛhari, the author of the *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, is also the author of the *Nītiśataka* and *Vairāgyaśataka*. The former deals with popular code of conduct while the latter with the need for curbing the worldly passions. The latter work lays emphasis on the worship of Śiva and contains a praise of the ascetics, besides stressing the need to eradicate the evils commonly found among the people. In the opinion of the scholars of the West, it is not proper to attribute to the same Bhartṛhari the authorship of the three *Śatakas* each one treating a different topic.

To Śaṅkarācārya is attributed the *Mohamudgara* also called *Bhajagovinda*. It recommends the giving up of worldly pleasures and the taking to the worship of God. This work has an ethical purpose and is philosophical in tone. Dāmodaragupta, a poet in the court of king Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (751-782 A.D.), composed a manual for courtesans by writing the *Kuṭṭanīmata* which is also called *Śambhalīmata*. Its popularity is attested by the numerous citations from it in the anthologies.

---

[1] *Janāśrayī* V-27 [2] *Śaṅkara : Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1.1.4
[3] *Tantravārtika* pp. 280, 281

Amitagati, a Jain writer, framed the rules for the monks and laymen in the *Subhāṣitaratnasandoha* which was written in 994 A.D. He attacks the Hindu practises and gods in this work. In 1014 A.D., he wrote the *Dharmaparīkṣā* which seeks to establish the superiority of *Jainism* over *Hinduism*.

Kṣemendra (C.1050 A.D.), the author of the abridgements of the epics, produced a number of works didactic and gnomic in character. The *Cārucaryā* is a collection of one hundred verses on the rules of good behaviour. The *Caturvargasaṅgraha* gives an admirable exposition of the four ends of human existence. The *Sevyasevakopadeśa* has sixty-one stanzas in the form of advice to the masters and servants in an ironical tone.

Vide :—भूमिशायी निराहारः शोतवातातपक्षतः ।
मुनिव्रतोऽपि नरकल्केशमश्नाति सेवक : ॥

The wiles of courtesans are treated in the *Samayamātṛkā*. The *Kalāvilāsa* deals with the various occupations pursued by the people of his time. It gives a vivid picture of the tricks and treacheries practised by certain sections of the people. The *Darpadalana* shows that pride in any form is to be condemned and illustrations are given in the form of tales.

Vide :—कुलं वित्तं श्रुतं रूपं शौर्यं दानं तपस्तथा ।
प्राधान्येन मनुष्याणां सप्तैते मदहेतवः ॥

Hemacandra (1088-1172), the Jain writer, is the author of the *Yogaśāstra* which gives an account of the duties of the Jains and the rigid practices peculiar to the ascetic temperament of the Jains. The *Mugdhopadeśa* containing the warnings against the wiles of the courtesans was composed about 1150 A.D. by Jalhaṇa, the author of the *Somapālavilāsa*. In imitation of Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka* and *Vairāgyaśataka*, was written the *Śāntiśataka* by Silhaṇa (C.1200 A.D.). In this work stress is laid on the need to practise mental peace. In 1276 A.D., Somaprabha composed the *Sṛṅgāravairāgyataraṅgiṇī* on the disadvantages of being in the company of women and the advantages of leading a life of detachment.

The *Subhāṣitanīvī* containing didactic passages in 145 stanzas was composed by Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.). His other work *Vairāgyapañcaka* brings out the need for practising detachment. The maxims of life are narrated together with illustrations by Kusumadeva (C. 1500 A.D.) in his *Dṛṣṭāntaśataka*. Dyādviveda wrote in 1494 A.D. the *Nītimañjarī* which illustrates the maxims of life by selecting the stories from the commentary of Sāyaṇa on the *Vedas*, *Ṛgveda*, *Bṛhaddevatā* and other texts. He takes in certain cases the Vedic passages and comments on them.

Jagannāthapaṇḍita's (1590-1665 A.D.) *Bhāminīvilāsa* contains four parts dealing with *anyokti*, *śṛṅgāra*, *karuṇā* and *śānti* in 101, 100, 19 and 32 stanzas respectively. It is suggested on the evidence of the word '*bhāminī*' used in the third part that the author is giving expression to his grief caused by the death of the woman Bhāminī by name who was probably his wife. The poem was therefore named after her. The last part, being an impassioned appeal to the soul, brings out vividly the greatness of the author as an inspired writer.

Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (C.1650 A.D.) is the author of four poems named *Kaliviḍambana*, *Sabhārañjanaśataka*, *Śāntivilāsa* and *Vairāgyaśataka*. The first mentioned work is a satire on the happenings in the *Kaliyuga*.

Vide :—यत्र भार्यागिरो वेदाः यत्र धर्मोऽर्थसाधनम् ।
यत्र स्वप्रतिभा मानं तस्मै श्रीकलये नमः ॥

The second work contains instructions to please a gathering of learned men and the royal court, and is full of caustic gnomes.

Vide :—जानाते यन्न चन्द्रार्कौ जानते यन्न योगिनः ।
जानीते यन्न भर्गोऽपि तज्जानाति कविः स्वयम् ॥

The *Śāntivilāsa* deals with the advantages of maintaining tranquillity of mind. The last mentioned work speaks highly of the advantages of leading a life of detachment. The *Upadeśaśataka* and *Subhāṣitakaustubha* seek to instruct people in good aspects of life and were composed respectively by Gumāni and Veṅkaṭādhvarin (C.1650 A.D.).

Anyāpadeśa is the name given to a type of poems which deal with a particular matter by making an indirect reference to it through some other thing. The earliest person, who adopted this method, was Bhallaṭa who wrote, under the patronage of Śaṅkaravarman (883-902 A.D.) of Kashmir, the *Bhallaṭaśataka* known after his name. The stanzas from this work are found cited in the anthologies.

Vide :—अन्तश्छिद्राणि भूयांसि कण्टका बहवो बहिः ।
कथं कमलनालस्य मा भूवन् भङ्गुरा गुणाः ॥

Under Harṣa (1089-1101 A.D.) of Kashmir, Śambhu composed the *Anyoktimuktālatā*. The first part of the *Bhāminīvilāsa* of Jagannātha paṇḍita is also called *Anyāpadeśaśataka*.

नैर्गुण्यमेव साधीयो धिगस्तु गुणगौरवम् ।
शाखिनोऽन्ये विराजन्ते खण्ड्यन्ते चन्दनद्रुमाः ॥

Of similar nature are the *Anyāpadeśaśataka* of Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (C.1650 A.D.) and the *Anyoktiśataka* of Vireśvara of unknown date.

CHAPTER XVI

ANTHOLOGY

Anthologies are collections of stanzas composed by different writers and arranged according to the subject-matter. The stanzas are taken from the poems, lyrics and also stray collections. Some of them mention the authors. Some of the stanzas so referred to in them are not found in the works of those particular writers as they are now available. It is only with the aid of these anthologies that some progress is being made in getting at the identity of the writers and their works. They are thus very useful in establishing the chronological account of the poets and their dates.

The earliest collection of verses of this type is the *Saptaśatī* familiarly known as *Gāthāsaptaśatī* consisting of seven hundred stanzas in *Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛta*. The stanzas depicting love in various aspects and composed by earlier writers are here collected together. Some among them have been identified as the compositions of Pravarasena, Māyurāja, Hāla and others. The author of the collections is said to be Hāla in the text as it is available. However, their authorship is attributed to Sātavāhana by Bāṇa.

Vide :—अविनाशिनमग्राम्यमकरोत्सातवाहनः ।
विशुद्धजातिभिः कोशं रत्नैरिव सुभाषितैः ।।

Harṣacarita : *Introductory stanza* 13

A king Hāla by name belonging to the dynasty of the *Sātavāhanas* flourished about 78 B.C. He might have composed the lyrical stanzas in *Prākṛta* and collected some or arranged for such a collection through a poet in his court and allowed it to pass under the family name *Sātavāhana*. The date of this work, which is also called *Sattasai*, may be fixed in the first century A.D. There is tenderness and aesthetic beauty in the stanzas. In the opinion of the scholars of the West, these collections had undergone several changes till a final shape was given to them.

The *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* is the earliest anthology of the *Saṁskṛta* stanzas. Rājaśekhara (C. 900 A.D.) is the last writer cited here. The date of the work may therefore be fixed about 1000 A.D. It contains 525 stanzas. The name of the author who collected them is not known. In 1131 A.D., the *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* which is also called *Mānasollāsa* was written by Someśvara, the son of Vikramāditya II of the *Cālukya* family. It contains much information on a variety of subjects. It has five parts dealing with kingship, and royal pastimes, which include all topics of intererst. "In connection with these subjects there are few branches of learning or art in Saṁskṛit the main principles of which are not stated. We have polity, astronomy, astrology, dialectics, rhetoric, poetry, music, painting, architecture, medicine, training of horses, elephants and dogs, &c."[1]

Govardhana was a poet, along with Dhoyi, Jayadeva and others in the court of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C.1169 A.D.). The method of the *Gāthāsaptaśatī* influenced this author in composing the *Āryāsaptaśatī* containing seven hundred *Saṁskṛta* stanzas dealing with the subject of love and arranged alphabetically. The stanzas chosen are in the *Āryā* metre and hence the name of the collection. During the same period and in the court of the same king, Śrīdharadāsa, son of Vaṭudāsa, collected, about 1200A.D., 2368 stanzas from 446 poets mostly of Bengal and gave the name *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* for this collection. Jalhaṇa, a minister of the Yādava king Kṛṣṇa (1247-1260 A.D.), prepared in 1257 A.D., the *Sūktimuktāvalī* taking 2790 stanzas from the works of 243 poets. To the same period belongs the *Prākṛta Vajjālaggam* of Jayavallabha.

The *Sūktiratnahāra* of Kaliṅgarāya Sūrya belongs to the first half of the 14th century. To the same period belongs the *Subhāṣitasudhānidhi* of Sāyaṇa, minister of the Vijayanagar kings and commentator on the *Vedas*. It contains the passages selected from the works of famous writers including Sāyaṇa's brother Bhoganātha whose works are now lost. At about the same time did Śārṅgadhara, son of Dāmodara, collect, in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, 4689 stanzas taken from 264 authors including himself and arranged them in 163 sections.

There is a *Subhāṣitāvalī* in manuscript by Sakalakīrti. Whether this author is identical with the Jain scholar of the same name whose date is 1450 A.D. is not established. To the same period belong the *Prasaṅgaratnāvalī* of Potayārya, *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Śrīvara, the pupil of Jonarāja and *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva. The work of Potayārya is dated 1466 A.D. Jonarāja's work contains stanzas from the works of more than 380 poets. The work of Vallabhadeva contains 3527 stanzas taken from the works of more than 350 poets mostly of North India and divided into 101 sections. The *Padyāvalī* of Rūpagosvāmin (C.1500 A.D.), pupil of Kṛṣṇacaitanya, contains 386 stanzas glorifying the worship of Kṛṣṇa taken from 125 authors. To the same period belongs the *Sūktivāridhi* of Peddibhaṭṭa. The passages from poets including his contemporaries are gathered by Harikavi (C.1700 A.D.) in his *Subhāṣitahārāvali*. About the same time was written the *Budhabhūṣaṇa* by Śambhu, the son of the *Mahārāṣṭra* chief Śivāji. This contains 883 stanzas. In the latter part of the last century, Dr. Bohtlingk collected nearly 8000 stanzas held to be the best in the *Saṁskṛta* literature and critically edited them with a prose German translation called *Indische Sprūche*. The *Padyāmṛtataraṅgiṇī* is the work of Haribhāskara of unknown date. The *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* is the name of a similar collection made by Śivadatta at the beginning of this century.

---

[1] Collected Works of R.G. Bhandarkar Vol. III p. 124

CHAPTER XVII

PROSE

Prose is called *gadya.* Its difference from poetry lies in its not having metrical lines.

Vide :—अपादः पदसंतानो गद्यम् ।

Kāvyādarśa I 23

The *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*, *Brāhmaṇas* and other portions of the Vedic texts, supplements of the *Vedas* and the earlier texts in sciences were written in this form. In the classical period, poetry preceded prose. The verses were found easy to remember while the prose was not. Therefore, prose was not recognised to be the vehicle for the thoughts of the poets in the early days of the classical period. Attracted by the metrical form, the critics did not come forward to appreciate prose. It was therefore more hard for a poet to compose prose than verse. Extraordinary talent was needed to compose prose.

Vide :—गद्यं कवीनां निकषं वदन्ति ।

In their attempt to satisfy the critics, who expected a high standard for prose compositions, the prose writers had to produce their works displaying certain peculiar features. Long compounds with epithets piled upon one another came to be used. The sentences became unduly long in descriptions. Little narration, more of description and absence of action came to characterise prose.

The prose compositions are considered to be mainly of two types viz., *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā*. *Kathā* shall be divided into parts called *lambakas* and have verses in *Āryā* metre. *Akhyāyikā* is to be divided into *ucchvāsas*, have verses in *Vaktra* and *Aparavaktra* metres, describe the kidnapping of the maidens, battles and other scenes and contain some marks peculiar to show that the work is by a particular poet. It shall be autobiographical in treatment while a *Kathā* may be narrated either by the author or by some one else. Among the earlier rhetoricians, Bhāmaha[1] maintained this distinction and Daṇḍin[2] held the view that a hard and fast line cannot be drawn between them, as the features noted above are found more violated than observed by the poets as evidenced in the extant works. The rhetoricians of the later period attempted to make the distinction between these two types marked by treating the *Ākhyāyikā* as dealing with realities and the *Kathā* with an invented theme. Besides these two types, there are minor ones called *Ākhyāna*, *Parikathā*, *Khaṇḍakathā* and others differing from each other to a slight degree.

That prose came to be used in the classical period even in very early times is shown by the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (150 B.C.) and the inscriptions of Rudradāman (150 A.D.), Hariṣeṇa (345 A.D.) and others. Patañjali refers to *Vāsavadattā*, *Sumanottarā* and *Bhaimarathī* as the names of prose compositions, the first two belonging to the *Ākhyāyikā* type.[1]

---

[1] *Kāvyālaṅkāra I* 23-30

[2] *Kāvyādarśa I* 24-28

Vararuci, the grammarian, is said to have written a prose work *Cārumatī* by name. The authorship of a *Śūdrakakathā* is attributed to Rāmila and Somila. A different work with the same name is attributed to Pañcaśikha by Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.). It is not known whether this work, whose mark is *ānanda*, is identical with the other *Śūdrakakathā*. The *Śātakarṇīharaṇa*, *Manovatī* and *Taraṅgavatī* are also prose works, some of which could have been in *Prākṛta*. Bhaṭṭāraharicandra and Āḍhyarāja are mentioned by Bāṇa as eminent prose writers. The works of these two writers are not known and are lost to us like the works mentioned above.

Bāṇa is the earliest prose writer whose works have come down to us. He is the author of the *Harsacarita* and *Kādambarī*. From the former work, it is learnt that Bāṇa was the son of Citrabhānu of Śrīvatsagotra. He was orphaned very early in age and after education gained much wisdom and experience by wandering throughout the country in the company of his associates each one representing one walk of life. He settled down in his village Pṛthukūṭa on the river Soṇa (now Sone). He was later invited to the court of Harṣavardhana who came to the throne in 606 A.D. After his return to his village, he wrote the *Harṣacarita* partly autobiographical and partly biographical. His literary activities could be assigned to the first half of the seventh century A.D.

To Bāṇa's authorship are attributed the devotional lyric *Caṇḍīśataka* and the *Mukuṭatāḍitaka* the nature of which is not known as it is now lost. Some critics chose to attribute to Bāṇa the three plays of Harṣavardhana, on the ground that Bāṇa, as a protege of Harṣavardhana, got much wealth from his patron[2] which leads us to the conclusion that Harṣavardhana's name came to be associated with these plays by Bāṇa himself for the money he got from the patron for this purpose. This suggestion is baseless for two reasons. Firstly, Bāṇa's verses are inferior to his prose as is clear from the *Caṇḍīśataka*. Therefore he could not have written any of these plays. Secondly, Bāṇa would have rather sold his name, if it can at all be proved, through the *Kādambarī* which would have fetched him a far higher price.

Among the two prose works, the *Harṣacarita* is the earlier composition. It has eight chapters called *Ucchvāsa*. Having given an account of his life, Bāṇa traces Harṣavardhana's ancestry to one Puṣpabhūtī. The work, which then deals with the lives of Prabhākaravardhana, his two sons Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana and his daughter Rājyaśrī, ends abruptly where Harṣavardhana is described to have placed his widowed sister to the care of a Buddhist monk and left the place to wreak vengeance on the assassin of his brother. What made Bāṇa desist from proceeding further with the story is not known. Death would not have been responsible for this, as the *Kādambarī* is found to be a later production. Perhaps, Harṣa's leanings to *Buddhism* were not tolerated by Bāṇa. The defeat inflicted on his patron by Pulakeśin II was not desired to be recorded. Bāṇa must have referred to these, if he had completed the work. However, this is only a conjecture and therefore inadmissible for want of evidence. In the introductory verses, Bāṇa mentions in praiseworthy terms, the works *Vāsavadattā*, and *Bṛhatkathā* and writers Bhaṭṭāraharicandra, Sātavāhana, Pravarasena, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa and Āḍhyarāja.

---

[1] *Mahābhāṣya* 4-2-60

[2] *Kāvyaprakāśa I*

The *Kādambarī* is a romance treating the love of two pairs viz., Kādambarī and Candrāpīḍa, and Mahāśveta, and Puṇḍarīka. Stories here are interwoven. Some of the characters in one story appear in their next births as the characters in other stories. The work was left incomplete by Bāṇa as he was snatched away by death. It was completed by his son Bhūṣaṇabāṇa.[1] In the introductory lines, Bāṇa pays his respects to one Bharcu, read also Bhartsu, who appears to have been his preceptor and who was highly honoured by the *Maukharī* kings.[2] A remote ancestor of Bāṇa was Kubera by name who was respected by many *guptas*.[3]

The two prose works are very helpful in understanding the condition of society in the days of Bāṇa. The wanderings he undertook in his youth in the company of his companions helped him by endowing him with the keen powers of observation, not found among other poets, which he utilised in studying minutely the customs and manners of the people. Hence the descriptions of forests and cities, palaces and military camps, penance groves and others are vivid and realistic. His study of the human mind under trials and emotions is best revealed in the *Kādambarī* when the heroine's conduct is studied as swayed by passion and bashfulness and in the *Harṣacarita* when the deaths of Prabhākaravardhana and Grahavarman are narrated and their effects described on the two sons of the former.

As a literary work, the *Kādambarī* is superior to the Harṣacarita. "On *Kādambarī* in particular, Bāṇa has spent all his wealth of observation, fullness of imagery and keenness of sympathy." In the *Kādambarī*, which seems to be based on Guṇāḍyha's *Bṛhatkathā*, the author had free scope to display his talents which was not had while writing the other work on a contemporary and real event. The *Kādambarī* is superior even from the points of diction and style. Hence has risen the saying कादम्बरीरसज्ञानामाहारोऽपि न रोचते ।

---

1. *Kādambarī : Uttarabhāga :* Introductory stanza 4.
2. „ *Pūrvabhāga stanza* 4.
3. „ „ „ 10

Here the word guptas may be taken to refer to merchants.

Bāṇa's style belongs to the *Pāñcālī* type. His name is associated with that of a poetess Śīlābhaṭṭārikā, whose work is not now available, in connection with the adoption of the *Pāñcālī* mode of writing.

Vide :—शब्दार्थयोः समो गुम्फो पांचाली रीतिरिष्यते ।
शीलाभट्टारिकावाचि बाणोक्तिषु च सा यदि ।।
Jalhaṇa's Sūktimuktāvalī.

The following are some of the characteristic features of Bāṇa's style. Allusions are recondite. Puns are repeatedly used. Long compounds, which are said to constitute the life of prose,[1] are used frequently. His vocabulary is very extensive and the words found in the *Harṣacarita* are seldom traced to the lexicons. The author revels in jingling assonance of sounds.

Vide :—तथागते भ्रातरि, उपरते च पितरि, प्रोषितजीविते च
जामातरि, मृतायां च मातरि, संयतायां च स्वसरि,
Harṣcarita, Ucchvāsa VI

His descriptions are full of long epithets in the beginning and gradually become shorter with smaller ones, thereby heightening the effect on the reader. Very often, he observes very little sense of proportion in them. His language is very often suited to sense. He depicts sentiments most successfully. In the work of no other poet is the language found to be so elasitc as in his works.

Bāṇa exhibits his great skill in characterisation. "He was by no means the mere lover of what was obstruse and difficult; he had also an eye for the picturesque and the pathetic, and he could sympathise with the men and women of his own time.",His love of nature is revealed everywhere in both the works. He has used to perfection not only the well-known figures of speech like *Upamā*, *Rūpaka*, *Utprekṣā* and others but also the rare and difficult ones like *Virodhābhāsa*, *Ākṣepa*, *Parisaṅkhyā*, *Vakrokti* and others.

The scholars of the West have criticised Bāṇa's style as 'an Indian wood where progress is impossible through the undergrowth until the traveller cuts out a path for himself, and where even then he is confronted by malicious wild beasts in the shape of unknown words to terrify him." It is true that an ill-equipped student of *Saṁskṛta* would be struck with terror on reading few lines of Bāṇa's works. One who has acquired a good grounding in *Saṁskṛta* would certainly be benefitted by the study of Bāṇa's works. He would not merely appreciate his passages but would get himself lost in wonder at the all comprehensive knowledge of Bāṇa revealed through his works. The charge therefore is not sustainable. If at all an attempt is made to point out certain features in Bāṇa's writing as defects, it must be remembered that such features are displayed in his works as a result of the standards of taste and regulations of poetics current in his time.

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa I* 80

Had Bāṇa fumbled in his treatment of the topics or the proper use of language, his works would have been ignored. Not only are the works of Bāṇa very popular as the best prose compositions but they have eclipsed the prose works written prior to him.

Bāṇa's work is "wholly made up of very few topics, disposed of in so many words, and exhibited in so many lights, that it reminds us of those arithmetical problems about permutations which so much astonish the unlearned." It is Bāṇa that made prose the receptacle of the grandest human thoughts.

Later writers have fully recognised the merit of Bāṇa's works. Daṇḍin, Dhanapāla, Dharmadāsa, Trivikrama, Soḍḍhala, Somadeva, Gaṅgādevī and others have praised his style in appropriate terms. Jayantabhaṭṭa the great logician (880 A.D.) praises Bāṇa thus.

Vide :—प्रकटरसानुगुणविकटाक्षररचनाचमत्कारितसकलकविकुला वाणस्य वाचः ।

Nyāyamañjari I p. 215

Bhuṣaṇabāṇa was the illustrious son of his father. He completed the *Kādambarī* left incomplete by his father. The credit goes to him for having made the story of the *Kādambarī* as contained in the *pūrvabhāga* understandable by giving a faithful version of that of the *uttarabhāga* as conceived by his father. Though he does uot rise to the heights reached by his father, he is not wanting in poetic talents.

Daṇḍin is the next great prose writer. Mystery surrounds his name and identity. The word *daṇḍin* does not shed any light on the probable identity of the writer. There are at present three works available that are ascribed to him. They are the *Avantisundarī*, *Daśakunāracarita* and *Kāvyādarśa*. Among these, the first two are prose works and the third is on rhetorics. The *Dvisandhānakāvya*, which is attributed to his authorship by Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.), is not available. A study of the three works mentioned above would suggest the authorship of them to three different writers each cne perhaps having had the name Daṇḍin. About Daṇḍin, some information is contained in the anonymous *Avantisundarikathāsāra*, a poem in eight *paricchedas*. This work containing the mark '*ānanda*' is incomplete and seems to be an epitome of the *Avantisundarī*.

From the *Avantisundarī* and *Avantisundarikathāṣara*, it is learnt that Daḍin descended from a family of *Kauśikagotra* Brahmins originally settled in Ānandapura situated in Gujarat. Dāmodara, the son of Nārāyaṇasvāmin, a member of that family. became a friend of Visṇuvardhana being introduced to him by Bhāravi.[1] In course of time, he joined Durvinita, the *Gaṅga* prince, who introdueed him to the court of Simhaviṣṇu, the Pallava king of Kāñcī. Dāmodara settled in Kāñcī. In course of time, Viradatta, the grandson of Dāmodara, had a son who was named Daṇḍin. When Kāñcī was attached by Pulakeśin II about 635 A. D. Daṇḍin had to leave the city. He had his education elsewhere and after much wandering returned to

---

[1] *Avantisundarikathāsāra I* 23.

Kāñcī when it was reconquered by Narasiṁhavarman I (630-668 A.D.) and his son Mahendravikraman II (668-670 A.D.). He settled in Kāñcī and enjoyed royal patronage.

The work *Avantisundarī* is autobiographical in the beginning. It contains a number of introductory *ślokas* full of lacunae and containing information about the poets who preceded Daṇḍin. The writers whose names are ascertained from them are Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Pāṇini Subandhu Guṇāḍhya, Mūladeva, Śūdraka, Bhāsa, Sarvasena,[1] Pravarasena, Kālidāsa, Nārāyaṇa, Bāṇa and Mayūra. It seems that Kumāradāsa, who was blind, is referred to in a *śloka* which contains only two words in the beginning.[2] In another *śloka*,[3] mention is made of the prose work *Manovatī*. Nārāyaṇa mentioned here may be Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa. Curiously enough, he is stated to be the author of three works. A poet is referred to as the emperor of poets. The portion referring to his name is missing. Some scholars identify this poet with Bhāravi.

The *Avantisundarī*, as far as it is available, deals with the major portion of the *pūrvapīṭhikā* of the *Daśakumāracarita*. From the *Avantisundarīkathāsāra*, which is also incomplete but is in continuation of the contents of the *Avantisundarī*, it is found that Daṇḍin must have written a fairly big work containing the entire story of the *Daśakumāracarita*. The accounts of the lives of Śūdraka, Vararuci, Vyāḍi and Upavarṣa as they are contained here differ from those given in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, an abridgement of Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā*. Daṇḍin gives an account of the royal dynasties[4] which agree with those contained in the *Purāṇas*. The story of the *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa is narrated briefly. In style, diction and descriptions, the *Avantisundarī* bears close comparison to Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.[5] Daṇḍin deserves the praise conveyed in the oft-quoted words दण्डिनः पदलालित्यम् । As Daṇḍin betrays close acquaintance with Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, he must have flourished about 680 A.D.

The *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* is of unknown authorship. In eight *paricchedas*, it takes the story up to a part of the story of Upahāravarman. It is very helpful in understanding the text of the *Avantisundarī*.

The *Daśakumāracarita*, which is attributed to the authorship of a Daṇḍin, is available in three sections viz., *Pūrvapīṭhikā*, main text and *Uttarapīṭhikā*. The first section which is in five *ucchvāsas* contains an account of the life of king Rājahaṁsa of Magadha, his defeat at the hands of Mānasāra, king of Ujjayinī, followed by his exile in the Vindhya forest, the birth of his son Rājavāhana, who is brought up with nine companions and the setting out of the ten

---

1. Author of the *Harivijaya*, a *Prākṛta* poem now lost
2. *Avantisundarī* Introductory stanza 16
3. " " 21
4. " pp. 178-179,& 183-185
5. " pp. 7, 24

companions in search of adventure. The ten youngmen get separated, each taking his own way. The main text narrates the experiences of them when they come together. The last section describes Rājahaṁsa's regaining his lost kingdom with the aid of his son and the latter's companions.

A study of these three sections reveals that they were written by different authors at different periods. In point of language, the main text is superior to the other two sections. There is discrepancy in the subject-matter between the main text and the other two sections. This shows that the original had the portions at the beginning and end lost and attempts were made later to restore them. This is clear from the availability of more than one version for these sections.

It has been suggested that the *Avantisundarī* represents the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* which is lost. This is supported by pointing out the close agreement in the details of the stories between the *Avantisundarī* and the main text. This however cannot be admitted, as the language, diction and mode of treatment in the two works exhibit disparity to prove that their authors must have been different. In the absence of evidences to the contrary, it may be admitted that with the breakdown of the *Pallava* rule at Kāñcī, the valuable treasures of literature were removed beyond the Western Ghats to places of safety. The *Avantisundarī* and the plays of Bhāsa must have been lost in *Kāñcī* and the neighbouring regions. Subsequent to this period, an attempt must have been made to have the story of the *Avantisundarī* composed by a competent writer who would have chosen to give the title *Daṣakumāracarita* for it and attribute it to Daṇḍin for ready acceptance in the later period. This version must have lost portions at the beginning and at the end and they were restored subsequently. The availability of such a text like the *Daśakumāracarita* in the 13th century A.D. is attested by the earliest rendering of it in Telugu by Ketana (C.1250 A.D.). The *Pūrvapīṭhikā,* as it is available, agrees very closely with the corresponding portion in the Telugu rendering.

As a prose composition, the *Daśakumāracarita* does not rise to any high level. It abounds in erroneous expressions and lacks in good taste. Long compounds which constitute the life of prose are of very rare occurrence. It is not however devoid of merits. Some of the descriptions are graphic and vivid. The seventh chapter in the main text is written fully without the use of the labial sound.

Both the *Avantisundarī* and *Daśakumāracarita* are not cited by the early rhetoricians. There is available a solitary reference to the former in the *Sūktiratnahāra* of Kaliṅgarāya Sūrya where the passage is quoted without mentoining the author. The silence of the writers over these two works must be due to the non-availability of the former after the twelfth century and to the latter not being the work of Daṇḍin. Besides, the low standard of the *Daśakumāracarita* judged in the light of the works of Bāṇa and those on rhetorics must

---

1. Sūktiratnahāra II 17

have led it to be ignored, though the stories therein have been popular. Therefore Daṇḍin is to be admitted as the author of the *Avantisundarī* and *Dvisandhāna* which is now lost.

Subandhu is the author of a prose *Vāsavadattā* by name which deals with the love of a princess Vāsavadattā for a prince Kandarpaketu. Subtle allusions taken from the *Itihāsas* and varied vocabulary abound in the work which is written in the *Gauḍī* style. The author boasts of his skill in employing puns.

Vide :—सरस्वतीदत्तवरप्रसादश्चक्रे सुवन्धुः सुजनैकवन्धुः ।
प्रत्यक्षरश्लेषमयप्रपंचविन्यासवैदग्ध्यनिधि प्रवन्धम् ।।

Vāsavadattā 299

Some scholars find a reference to this work in one of the introductory stanzas of Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*[1], but Bāṇa must have been a predecessor of Subandhu as the *Vāsavadattā* betrays the influence of the works of Bāṇa.[2] The absence of reference to the author's name in the stanza of Bāṇa suggests a later date for Subandhu. The work which Bāṇa mentions must be identical with the *Vāsavadattā* to which references are made by Patañjali in the *Mahābhāṣya*[3] and Daṇḍin in the *Avantisundarī*.[4] Daṇḍin refers to the *Bṛhatkathā*, *Setubandha* and *Kādambarī* in the *Avantisundarī*[5]. The absence of reference to the *Vāsavadattā* in the context shows that Subandhu could have been a contemporary of Daṇḍin in the latter half of the seventh century. The passages न्यायविद्यामिवोद्योतकरस्वरूपां and बौद्धसंगतिमिवालंकार भूषितां[6] found in the *Vāsavadattā* refer to Uddyotakara (6th century A.D.) and the work of the Buddhist logician Dharmakīrti (C. 630 A.D.) respectively. Hence Subandhu must have lived after Bāṇa about the beginning of the eighth century A.D.

The *Tilakamañjarī* describing the love of a princess Tilakā and a prince Samaraketu was written about 973 A.D. by Dhanapāla. It is in close imitation of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*. Dhanapāla refers to himself as the son of an eminent scholar Sarvadeva.[7] He was patronised by king Muñja of Dhārā.[8] In the introductory portion, he refers to Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Pravarasena, Jīvadeva, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Samarāditya, Bhadrakīrti, Māgha, Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti, Vākpatirāja and Rājaśekhara. The *Bṛhatkathā* and *Taraṅgavatī* are the two works mentioned therein.

Odayadeva, who had the title *Vādībhasiṁha*, wrote the *Gadyacināmaṇi* in eleven *lambakas* on the life of a prince Jīvandhara who became an ascetic. The advice given to Jīvandhara is modelled on that of Śukanāsa which was given to Candrāpīḍa in the *Kādambarī*. Oḍayadeva, whose date may be fixed about 1200 A.D., is the author of another work *Kṣatracūḍāmaṇi* a Saṁskṛta rendering of the *Jīvakacintāmaṇi* a work in Tamil.

---

[1] कविनामगलद्दर्पो नूनं वासवदत्तया ।
शक्त्येव पाण्डुपुत्राणां गतया कर्णगोचरम् ॥
Harṣacarita : Introductory stanza 11

[2] Introduction to the Vāsavadattā-Vani Vilas Edn. Srirangam

[3] Mahābhāṣya 4-2-60

[4] Avantisundarī : Introductory stanza 6

[5] ,, p. 20

[6] Vāsavadattā p. 303

[7] *Tilakamañjarī* 52

[8] *Tilakmañjarī* 53

Agastya (1320 A.D.), the author of the *Bālabhārata*, wrote the prose *Kṛṣṇacarita*. Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa (1420 A.D.), the author of the *Raghunāthacarita* and *Nalābhyudaya*, is the author of the *Vemabhūpālacarita* which is also known as *Vīranārāyaṇacarita* tracing the ancestry of Vemabhūpala and describing his life. It is in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṁśa* and *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. Bāṇa's influence is found at every stage. The author claims a rank, which he does not deserve, with Bāṇa, Subandhu and Kavirāja. The *Mudrārākṣasapūrvasaṁkathānaka* is a prose rendering of the story of Viśākhadatta's *Mudrārākṣasa* by Anantaśarman (C. 1650 A.D.). It contains a prayer to Kāli in the *daṇḍaka* type.

CHAPTER XVIII

CAMPU

Apart from the two types of compositions, viz., poem and prose, there is a third type called *Campu*. It is an admixture of prose and verse.

Vide :—गद्यपद्यमयी काचिच्चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते ।

Kāvyādarśa I 31

Prose and verse are given equal importance. Prose is generally used for narrations and descriptions. Poetry is used for effective and compact statement. This admixture of prose and verse in the *Campu* is hailed as the combination of vocal and instrumental music[1] by Bhoja and of the grapes and honey[2] by Veṅkaṭādhvarin.

This type of composition must have come into existence before the beginning of the Christian era. The inscriptions of the Gupta period bear evidence to its popularity and prevalence in the 4th century A.D. The books written in this form are called *Campus* but some drop the word *campu* in their title.

The earliest *Campu* now available is the *Nalacampu* which is also called *Damayantīkathā*. It was written by Trivikramabhaṭṭa in a sequel with a poet who challenged his father then absent in the place. It was left incomplete on the arrival of his father to his place. In seven *ucchvāsas*, it describes the story of Nala and Damayantī and has *haracaraṇasaroja* as its mark. The advice given to Nala by the minister Sālaṅkāyana is after the model of Sukanāsa's advice to Candrāpīḍa. The author imitates Bāṇa successfully. He is called *Yamunātrivikrama* on account of his description of the dawn comparing it to the confluence of the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā.[3] In the introductory portion, he mentions Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Bāṇa and Guṇāḍhya. There he mentions himself as the son of Nemāditya and as belonging to Śāṇḍilyagotra. He is the author of another Campu called *Madālasācampu* and of the Nausāri grant of the *Rāṣṭrakūṭa* king Indra III dated 915 A.D. His date may therefore be fixed in the first half of the tenth century.

The *Yaśastilakacampu* in eight *āśvāsas* is the work of Somadeva, pupil of Nemideva, the foremost among the logicians of the day. It was written in 959 A.D. It describes the sacrifice of king Māridatta who offered a pair of beings. He was taught the futility of performing them by a sage Sudatta and was converted into the Jain faith.

---

[1] *Campūrāmāyaṇa-Bālakāṇḍa* 3
[2] *Viśvaguṇādarśa* 4
[3] Nalacampu VI 1

The last three chapters form a popular handbook on *Jainism*. Tales are woven within tales as in the *Kādambarī*. The author mentions the following writers, Urva, Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti, Bhartṛhari, Bhartṛmeṇṭha, Kaṇṭha, Guṇāḍhya, Vyāsa, Bhāsa, Vosa, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Mayūra, Nārāyaṇa, Kumāra (Kumāradāsa?), Māgha, Rājaśekhara, and Bhāratapramitakāvyādhyāya. This *Campu* is also called by the name *Yaśodharamahārājacarita*.

The *Rāmāyaṇacampu* is attributed to Bhoja, king of Dh*ārā*. The colophons in the printed text refer to the author as Vidarbharāja without mentioning the name of the author. The city of Dhārā was in Mālava. Vidarbha and Mālva were always different states. The justification for the title *Vidarbharāja* as applied to Bhoja is not available. Bhoja's authorship must be admitted on the strength of tradition. The *Rāmāyaṇacampu* was written by Bhoja upto the end of the *Sundarakāṇḍa*. The *Yuddhakāṇḍa* was written later by onc Lakṣmaṇa. Written in the *Vaidarbhī* style, it is one of the best *Campus* ever written in *Saṁskṛta*. Descriptions are highly imaginative, marked by alliteration (*anuprāsa*) and attractive similes.[1] Kumāradāsa's influence is felt in some of these.[2]

The *Bhāgavata* story is narrated by Abhinavakālidāsa (C.1050 A.D.) in the *Bhāgavatacampu* in six *stabakas*. Identity of the author is not established. Though the author avows to desist from treating love-topics in the story of God,[3] he himself violates this principle.[4] The *Udayasundarīkathā* was composed by a Kṣatriya writer Soḍḍhala (C.1050 A.D.) In six *ucchvāsas*, it describes the marriage between Udayasundarī a *Nāga* princess and Malayavāhana, king of Pratiṣṭhāna. The first chapter is autobiographical. A parrot narrates the tale as in the *Kādambarī*. Bāṇa's influence is felt at every stage. The *campu* has *sārasvataśrī* as its mark. The author has used certain words foreign to the *Saṁskṛta* language, *e.g.*, क्षक् . झम्प: etc. In the introductory portion, the author mentions Cittarāja, Nāgārjuna and Mummunirāja, kings of Koṅkaṇa and also Vatsarāja, the Cālukya king of Lāṭa as his patrons. He mentions there Vālmīki, Vyāsa, Vākpatirāja, Māyurāja, Viśākhadeva, Guṇāḍhya, Bhartṛmeṇṭha, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti, Abhinanda, Yāyāvara (Rājaśekhara), Kumāradāsa and Bhāsa. Bāṇa is said to have been presented hundreds of crores of gold by king Harṣavardhana. His reference to Abhinanda, Vākpatirāja, Kālidāsa and Bāṇa is graphic.

Vide :—वागीश्वरं हन्त भजेऽभिनन्द-
मर्थेश्वरं वाक्पतिराजमीडे ।
रसेश्वरं स्तौमि च कालिदासं
वाणं तु सर्वेश्वरमानतोऽस्मि ।।

Udayasundarīkathā

---

1. *Rāmāyaṇacampu-Bālakāṇḍa* 41, *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* 70, *Sundarakāṇḍa* 17, 20
2. „ *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* 33
3. *Bhāgavatacampu* I 12
4. „ III & VI

Someśvaradeva (1240 A.D.), the author of the *Surathotsava*, celebrated, in the *Kīrtikaumudī*, the life of Vastupāla, minister of Vīradhavala. The *Gaṅgā* dynasty which ruled over Kaliṅga was celebrated by Vāsudevaratha (C.1420 A.D.) in his *Gaṅgāvaṁśānucarita*. The life of Rāmānuja, the greatest exponent of the Viśiṣṭādvita Vedānta, was narrated by Rāmānujācārya (C. 1600 A.D.) in the *Rāmānujacampu* written in an elegant and chaste style. About the same period, the story of the *Mahābhārata* was written by Anantabhaṭṭa in the *Bhāratacampu* containing twelve *stabakas*. At the end of the work, there is a reference to the author, probably by himself, as very reputed and as the composer of sweet poetry. To the same period belongs the *Varadāmbikāpariṇayacampu* written by Tirumalāmbā, the queen of the Vijayanagar king Acyutarāya, describing her husband's marriage with a princess Varadāmbikā. It is written in fine and attractive style and rarely exhibits the skill of the authoress in the use of *bhaṅgaśleṣa*. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (C.1600), the author of the *Nārāyaṇīya*, is the author of the *Pāñcālīsvayaṁvaracampu* describing Draupadi's *svayaṁvara*. It is written in an elegant and simple style and is absolutely free from long compounds and puns. At about the same time, Samarapuṅgavadīkṣita described the places of pilgrimage in North and South India in the *Yātrāprabandha* containing nine *āśvāsas*. The birth and the exploits in childhood of Śrīkṛṣṇa, as depicted in the *Bhāgavata*, are recorded in the *Ānandakandacampu* by Mitramiśra, the author of the *Vīramitrodaya*, the text on law. The date of the work is given as 1632 A.D. The work abounds in *bhaṅgaśleṣa*. The *Bhāgavatacampu*, based on the *Bhāgavata*, is attributed to Cidambara (C.1600 A.D.), the author of the *Rāghavapāṇḍavayādavīya*. The incident of bringing the celestial tree Pārijāta down to the earth is described in the *Pārijātaharaṇacampu* in five chapters by Śeṣakṛṣṇa (C.1600 A.D.), son of Nṛsiṁhasūri.

Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (C.1650 A.D.) wrote the *Nīlakaṇṭhavijayacampu* in five chapters describing the exploits of Śiva. His skill in bringing out the subtleties of the sentiments is admirably revealed here. About the same period, Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita composed the *Bhāratacampu*. The *Draupadīpariṇayacampu*, in six *āṣvāsas*, was written by Cakrakavi, the contemporary of Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita. Veṅkaṭādhvarin of this period is known as the author of four *campus* viz., *Viśvaguṇādarśa*, *Varadābhyudaya*, *Uttaracampu* and *Śrīnivāsacampu*. The first work gives a picture of both the good and bad aspects of life. This is done in the form of conversations between two Gandharvas Viśvāvasu and Kṛśānu. The drawbacks in the manners and customs of the people of his time are very well brought out. There is a brief reference to the Madras city.[1] The Mahrāṣṭrians study zealously the foreign language (*hūṇabhāṣa*).[2] The priests, musicians, astrologers, physicians and a host of others become the targets of attack and their weaknesses are exposed with abundant

---

1. *Viśvaguṇādarśa* 409-417
2. „ 191

irony The author is a master of alliteration (*anuprāsa*). The second work is in praise of the deity in Kāñcī. It is also called by the name *Hastigiricampu.* The third work deals with the story of the *Uttararāmāyaṇa* and is incomplete. The last work has two sections each containing five *ucchvāsas*. It is in praise of the deity on the Tirumalai hills. The author exhibits his skill in alliteration, pun, and *bandha*. In the second section, he mentions the names of some poets like Somanāthakavi, Kahoḍa, Nīlakaṇṭha and others.

Bāṇesvara Vidyālaṅkāra (C. 1700 A.D.) deals with the spiritual journey of the soul according to Bengal Vaiṣṇavism in the *Citracampu.* The holy place of Bṛndāvana is described. The author describes a pilgrimage which he undertook with Maharāja Citrasena, king of Burdwan. It is therefore a quasi-historical work. The author betrays his skill in *bhaṅgaśleṣa* very rarely and owes much to Bāṇa. In 1709 A.D., Kṛṣṇakavi glorified his patron and his family who lived in Wanaparti (Āndhra) by writing the *Raghunāthavijayacampu.* The *Mandāramarandacampu* of Śrīkṛṣṇakavi of unknown date is a *Campu* only by courtesy. It has few prose passages and contains illustrations for the figures of speech. The *Ānandaraṅgavijayacampu* of Śrīnivāsakavi in eight chapters describes the life of Ānandaraṅgam Pillai, the Dubhash of the French at Pondicherry. The author, who was patronised by Ānandaraṅgam Pillai, gives accurate descriptions of contemporary events. The work therefore has historical value. Its date is fixed in the 18th century. In the first half of the 19th century, King Serfoji II of Tanjore composed the *Kumārasambhavacampu* summarising the contents of the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa. The *Sarvadevavilāsa*, whose author is not known, describes the Madras city and the merchants there. It is of great value as it gives some detailed accounts of the various parts of the city about 1800 A.D. It contains many idioms which are of Tamil origin and usage. It contains six *āśvāsas* and is incomplete.

CHAPTER XIX

POPULAR TALE

Fables are very popular with the Indians from very early times. They are based on adventures, sea-voyages and other occurrences and also on the imagination of those who could invent stories. They are generally connected with supernatural happenings like the movements of beings in the sky and the mountainous regions, those of the Gandharvas and other semi-divine beings. During the period of the growth of this literature, religious spirit began to exercise its influence in this sphere. The Buddhists and the Jains began to adopt the form of the fables to present their doctrines.

It is not known what language was used in earlier stages for these tales and what forms such tales assumed. Since these tales were popular in their origin, *Prākṛta* could have been used then. Nothing can be said about the form, as no evidence is available about this.

The first work of this kind of composition was the *Bṛhatakathā* of Guṇāḍhya. The original is now lost and is known from its abridgements *Ślokasaṅgṛaha*, *Bṛhatkathāmañjari* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*. A tale narrated by Siva to Pārvatī was overheard by Puṣpadanta one of their attendants. Puṣpadanta was cursed by Pārvatī, who came to know of this, that he should be born a mortal and having told the tale he heard to a goblin Kāṇabhūti, shall return to his place. Mālyavān, the brother of Puṣpadanta, intervened in the matter and was cursed to be a mortal and his return to his place would take place after he hears the tale from Kāṇabhūti. Accordingly, Puṣpadanta was born as Vararuci, the grammarian and minister of the Nandas. After retirement from service, he went to the Vindhya forest, met Kāṇabhūti and having told him the story, went back to his place. Mālyavān was born as Guṇādhya and became the minister of king Sātavāhana ruling at Pratiṣṭhāṇa. In a sequel with Śaravarman, a rival of his, which arose about the question of teaching *Saṁskṛta* to the king who was ignorant of it, Guṇādyha avowed not to use *Saṁskṛta* any longer for literary purposes. He quit his service, repaired to the Vindhya forest which lay near-by, listened to the tale from Kāṇabhūti and committed it to writing. The tale, which was written in the *Paiṣācī* language, was shown to the king by Guṇāḍyha's pupils. Upon the king's refusal to have it, Guṇādhya consumed it to the forest fire. Through the efforts of his pupils, a seventh portion of the tale was saved from destruction. After this, Guṇāḍhya went back to his place.

The contents of the *Bṛhatkathā* which was written by Guṇāḍhya, are available from its abridgements. The tale deals with the adventures of Naravāhanadatta, son of Udayana of Kauśāmbī. Naravāhanadatta proceeds to the forest along with his friend Gomukha to seek his adventures. During that period, he marries a Vidyādhara princess Madanamañjukā by name. She is kidnapped by one Mānasavega whose sister Vegavatī aids Naravāhanadatta in his searches for his beloved. The beloved is got back and Naravāhanadatta becomes the emperor of the Vidhyādharas. Several other tales are found introduced in the *Bṛhatkathā*.

The *Bṛhatkathā* is mentioned by Bāṇa, Daṇḍin, Subandhu, Trivikramabhaṭṭa, Dhanañjaya and others. Durvinīta, the *Gaṅgā* prince, is said to have rendered the original into *Saṁskṛta*. Budhasvāmin of the 9th century A.D., Kṣemendra and Somadeva of the first half of the 11th century A.D., who abridged the original into *Saṁskṛta*, state that the original text was available to them.

From the contents of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, it is learnt that Vararuci must have lived about 320 B.C. in the reign of Candragupta the Mauryan king. Sātavāhana, the patron of Guṇāḍhya, must have been one of the kings of the *Āndhrajātīya* dynasty. Making allowances for the long life of the goblin Kāṇabhūti, the period of Guṇāḍhya's literary activities shall be taken to be about the beginning of the christian era.

The language *Paiśācī* appears to have been one of the dialects spoken by the wild tribes in the Vindhya region which is adjacent to Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī where Guṇādhya lived. This receives the support of Rājaśekhara (C.900 A.D.), the author of the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*. In his report on the Linguistic Survey of India, Mr. Grierson wrote that the Paiśācī dialect was spoken in the North-western regions of India. This statement shall be justified on the ground that there were eleven *Paiśācī* dialects spoken in different part of the country.[1] The *Paiśācī* language was put to literary use by Guṇāḍhya.

Vide :—भूतभाषामयीं प्राहुरद्भुतार्थां बृहत्कथाम् ।

Kāvyādarśa I 38

An inscription in Cambodia (C. 875 A.D.) refers to Guṇāḍhya's aversion to *Prākṛta*.

The form of the original *Bṛhatakathā* is not known. The abridgements are in the form of verse. The title *Bṛhatkathā* would suggest the prose form for the original. In the absence of evidences, it is better to leave this question as it is, taking the word *kathā* to mean simply a story.

The *Bṛhatakathā* evoked much admiration in the writers of the later days and influenced their writings.

Vide :—समुद्दीपितकन्दर्पा कृतगौरीप्रसाधना ।
हरलीलेव नो कस्य विस्मयाय बृहत्कथा ।।

Harṣacarita : Introductory stanza 17

Bāṇa, Subandhu and Daṇḍin refer to its popularity.

---

1. *Saḍbhāṣācandrikā*-p. 4

Among the abridgements of the *Bṛhatakathā*, the earliest is the *Ślokasaṁgraha* or *Bṛhatkathā ślokasaṁgraha* by Budhasvāmin of Nepal. Its title suggests that the original might have been composed in verse. It contains 28 cantos and 4539 stanzas. This appears to be incomplete and judged from the portion available, the work of Budhasvāmin, if it was completed, would have consisted of about 2,5000 stanzas. The absence of descriptions and the frequent occurrence of the *Prākṛta* forms suggest that this version may be nearer the original. There is no evidence to connect this with Nepal apart from the fact that the manuscript of this work was discovered in Nepal. The date of the work is fixed in the eighth or ninth century A.D. on the condition of its ma nuscript.

The other abridgement *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* was prepared in 1037 A.D. by Kṣemendra, the author of the abridgements of the epic stories. It is in nineteen chapters containing 7,500 stanzas. It varies from the *Ślokasaṁgraha* in its contents. This suggests the inclusion into the body of the work of some tales which were current in Kashmir or elsewhere, *e.g.*, the tale of Vikrama and the Vampire. The attempt of Kṣemendra to condense the lengthy story of the original in 7,500 stanzas has resulted in his work having become unintelligible. The adventures of Naravāhanadatta have secondary importance in this work.

The third abridgement *Kathāsaritsāgara* or *Bṛhatkathāsaritsāgara* was prepared by Somadeva, son of Rāma of Kashmir between 1063 and 1081 A.D. It is divided into eighteen *lambakas* and sub-divided into 124 *taraṅgas*. It contains 24,000 stanzas. Like the work of Kṣemendra, this too has the stories of Kashmir. Here is given an account of the circumstances which led to the writing of the *Bṛhatkathā*. Kāṇabhūti narrated to Guṇāḍhya seven stories in his language (*piśāca*). Guṇāḍhya took seven years to compose this in seven lakhs of stanzas. He wrote it using his own blood as ink. What remained after destruction is the story of Naravāhanadatta in one lakh of stanzas.[1] Somadeva's work is superior to that of Kṣemendra in taste and sensibility. His style is attractive and simple.

The *Avadānaśataka* is a collection of one hundred tales of *avadāna* which, in the Buddhist literature, means the heroic deed. These tales are intended to prove that the life of a person is shaped by the nature of his deeds in the previous births. The author of this collection is not known. The tales are very old. This work was translated into *Chinese* in the middle of the 3rd century A.D. The date of this may be taken to have been about the 1st century A.D. The *Divyāvadāna* is a later collection made on this model. One of the tales from this was translated into *Chinese* in 265 A.D. The date of this may be placed in the same period. Both these are in *Saṁskṛta* prose with some verses included in *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta*. The tales in the former show an arrangement in the plan while they are not in the latter.

---

[1] *Kathāsaritsāgara* 2

Kṣemendra (C.1050 A.D.) is the author of the *Avadānakalpalatā* also called *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* which contains 107 tales taken from the *Avadānaśataka* and other allied texts.

The *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra is a collection of the *Jātakas* which contain the stories describing the life of a *bodhisattva* in one of his previous births. These stories are in the form of fables, anecdotes and tales in prose interspersed with verses. It is held that the number of such tales is about five hundred. Some among them are non-Buddhistic in origin. Āryaśūra was perhaps their compiler. One Bhattakaṇa is said to have scrutinised them. The date of this work must be placed before 400 A.D., as it was translated into *Chinese* in 434 A.D. The *Sūtrālaṅkāra* or *Kalpanāmaṇḍitaka* written in prose and verse is a collection of the *Jātakas* and the *avadānas*. The original is available in a fragmentary form. Aśvaghoṣa was considered the author of this but recently it has been found that Kumāralāta is its author and that he came after Aśvaghoṣa.

The *Vetālapañcaviṁśati* is a collection of twenty-five tales describing how king Vikramāditya tried to get hold of a vampire which narrated to him these tales. These tales are found included in the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Apart from these two versions, there are available a version in prose and verse by Śivadāsa of the 12th century A.D., a prose version by Jambhāladatta, an abbreviated version by one Vallabhadeva and an anonymous version in prose. The popularity of this work is attested by its translations into many Indian languages. Connected with Vikramāditya are many fables like the *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā*. One such fable is the *Siṁhāsanadvātriṁśikā*, a collection of thirty-two stories which were narrated by the images sculptured in each one of the thirty-two steps of the throne of Vikramāditya. They were narrated to king Bhoja who having discovered the throne attempted to ascend it. The images obstructed him from occupying the throne for thirty-two days, each image recounting the feats of Vikramāditya one on each day. The date and author of the work are not known. The work is also known by the names *Dvātriṁśatputtalikā* and *Vikramārkacarita*. There is a *Jain* version of this by one Kṣemaṅkara of the 14th century. In Bengal, there is a version which is attributed to Vararuci. In South India, the *Siṁhāsanadvātriṁśikā*. is known as *Vikramārkacarita*. Other works which narrate the adventures of Vikramāditya are the *Vīracarita* by Ananta, *Vikramodaya* of unknown authorship, *Pañcadaṇḍacchatraprabandha* of *Jain* origin, *Śālivāhanakathā* of Śivadāsa who wrote the *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā* and others.

The *Śukasaptati* of unknown date and unknown authorship is a collection of seventy tales which a parrot narrates for seventy nights to its mistress who, taking advantage of her husband's absence in the house, attempted to prove faithless to him. The parrot went on narrating the tales every day throughout the night and saved its mistress from betraying her husband. This work is in prose. A

Persian version of this work was made in the 14th century A.D. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) was aware of its existence. The work must have been composed before 1,000 A.D.

In the 16th century A.D., Ballālasena wrote the *Bhojaprabandha* mostly in verse with little prose. This work gives an account of the poets' activities in the court of king Bhoja. The literary sessions held there were presided over by Bhoja and the participants were Kālidāsa, Daṇḍin, Bāṇa, Māgha, Bhavabhūti, Maheśvara and others. The accounts contained in this work are full of wit and humour. The following *śloka*, in the form of *samasyāpūraṇa*,[1] reflects the activities there :—

भोज :—परिपतति पयोनिधौ पतङ्गः
वाण :—सरसिरुहामुदरेषु मत्तभृङ्गः
महेश्वर :—उपवनतरुकोटरे विहङ्गः
कालिदास :—युवतिजनेषु शनैः शनैरनङ्गः ॥

The work contains an account of Bhoja's accession to the throne after Muñja.

The *Kathārṇava*, containing thirty-five tales, was written by Śivadāsa, the author of the *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā*. In 1451 A.D., Śrīvīrakavi wrote the *Kathākautuka* in fifteen chapters on the story of Yusuf and Zuleika. It is written in verse form. The attempt of Śrīvīra, pupil of Jonarāja, to write stories like this shows that stories of foreign origin became the subject-matter of *Saṁskṛta* works. The *Mādhavānalakathā* of Ānanda of unknown date, *Puruṣaparīkṣā* of Vidyāpati and others belong to this kind of literature.

---

[1] Completing the stanza, the part of which is already composed by another is known as *samasyāpūraṇa*.

———

CHAPTER XX

DIDACTIC FABLES

The didactic fable formed a special feature of the Indian literature from very early times. It is possible to find a reference to the existence of this literature in the pre-Christian era. Patañjali (150 B.C.) explains the formation of words like *ajākṛpāṇīya*, *kākatālīya*[1] and others which suggest the connection of these words with some fables. The didactic fable is written in prose with verses quoted which are drawn freely from the lawbooks and the epics. These verses convey moral sense in support of which the stories are given in prose. Generally within the framework of a fable a number of stories is introduced one being linked to the other through the didactic verses. This method of boxing tales within tales became very popular and was borrowed from India by the foreigners who produced the Arabian Nights. *Saṃskṛta* was the language used for this purpose.

One special feature of these tales is the attribution of human tendencies to the animals and birds. The tales concerning their activities are narrated to illustrate the dark and bright sides of life. This practise receives its support from the theory of transmigration. A reference to this kind of practice is to be found in the *Mahābhārata* in which Vidura asks Dhṛtarāṣṭra not to kill or persecute the Pāṇḍavas lest he should kill the bird that gave gold. The *Jātakas* of the Buddhists betray similar features.

These fables deal with man's activities in the political sphere and in every day life. The texts which are now available show that these were narrated to the members of the ruling class who were to be trained in statecraft and to be taught to conduct themselves properly as the hour and occasion demand. This being the ulterior motive, these fables expose the dark side of life namely, hypocrisy and avarice of the Brahmins, the cunning intrigues in the harems and the faithlessness of the women and also the bright side of life namely, the greatness and piety of the Brahmins, the importance attached to the discharge of their duties by the members of the ruling class and fidelity of the house-wives. The vices are exposed with abundant irony.

In respect of form, there does not appear any strict line of demarcation between a popular tale and didactic fable. Still it is clear that story is given importance in the popular tales and didactic matter in the didactic fables.

The chief representative texts of this literature are the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*. The former has many versions each differing in slight respects. All these do not appear to have taken their rise independently. It seems that they are all based on an original text which is now lost. A vague picture of the nature of this text could be gathered from certain evidences. An original text written in *Saṁskṛta* was rendered into *Pahlavi* for the *Persian* king Naushirvan by his physician Burzoe. In 570 A.D., a *Syrian* version was made from this *Pahlavi* version by one Bud and an Arabic version about 750 A.D. On the Arabic version were based the later versions in many European languages *e.g.*, the *Hebrew* version in 1100 A.D., the *Latin* about 1270 A.D., the *German* in 1480 A.D., the *Italian* in 1552 A.D., the *French* in 1678 A.D., the *Greek* in 1080 A.D., the *Persian* in the 12th century A.D., and others. The original which was written is said to have been lost along with the *Pahlavi* version. The date of the composition of the original must be before 570 A.D., the date of the *Syrian* rendering of the *Pahlavi* version and therefore could be fixed about the third century A.D., when a need for a work of this type must have been felt by the members of the ruling class who were trying to overthrow the foreign yoke. Kashmir was the place of its origin according to some Western scholars. According to others, it was Magadha. The author was a Vaiṣṇava according to Dr. A.B. Keith.[1] The fable could not have owed its origin to the Buddhists as suggested by some scholars, since *Buddhism* derived much from *Hinduism*. The name of the original text is not known. The titles *Kalilāg* and *Damnāg* for the *Pahlavi* version and *Kalilah* and *Damnah* for the *Arabian* version suggest the title *Karkaṭaka* and *Damanaka* for the original text. However, this suggestion does not deserve ready acceptance, since *Karkaṭaka* and *Damanaka* are the names of characters introduced in the first section of the *Pañcatantra*. The only conclusion that could be arrived at from this is that the *Pāhlavi* version must have been made only for the first section of the original text in *Saṁskṛta*. The title of the original can therefore be taken as *Pañcatantra*, in the absence of evidences to the contrary. The original text need not be assumed to have been lost. The various versions point to the redactions of the original *Pañcatantra* to suit the needs of the regions where they have risen. That much reliance cannot be placed on the Syrian or any other version to learn about the original is proved by the *Syrian* version having ten sections and the *Arabian* twenty-two.

---

[1] Mahābhāṣya 2-1-3

The word *tantra* in the title *Pañcatantra* may be taken to denote a book, a work on conduct or a trick. The *Pañcatantra* has five sections called *Mitrabheda*, *Mitralābha*, *Vigraha*, *Labdhapraṇāśa* and *Aparīkṣitakāraka*. Of these, the first deals with the policy of divide and rule which is illustrated by the estrangement created between a lion and a bull by two jackals. The value of friendship and mutual alliance is the subject of the second section. In the third section are treated war, its causes and the possibilities of peace. The fourth section shows how one would lose what he has owing to carelessness.

---

[1] A.B. Keith : Classical Sanskrit Literature p. 99 (Heritage of India Series)

That inconsiderate action would bring about ruin is dealt with in the last section. The later versions of the *Pañcatantra* keep the section intact but differ in the choice of the stories for illustrating the aims and purposes of the different sections. The *Pañcatantra* is written in the orm of prose and verse.

Two distinct versions of the *Pañcatantra* now available, viz., *Tantrākhyāyikā* and *Pañcatantra*. The *Syrian* version resembles the former very closely. It is written in a simple style. The word *ākhyāyikā* in the title would suggest that this is an attempt to present the *Pañcatantra* in the form of a narrative. This text is of Kashmir origin. The latter is available in many forms. The *Bṛhatkathā* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* have their own versions of the *Pañcatantra*. A *Jain* version made about 1100 A.D., has the stories altered and has some new stories added. It contains quotations from Māgha (700 A.D.) and Rudrabhaṭṭa (C. 900 A.D.). In 1199 A.D., a Jain writer Pūrṇabhadra by name brought out a version based on the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, on the *Jain Pañcatantra* and other sources. The *Gujarātī* and *Prākṛta* expressions occur in this text which is called *Pañcākhyānaka*. The Jain writer Meghavijayagaṇi (1660 A.D.) wrote the *Pañcākhyānoddhāra* which contains a number of interesting fables. There are many versions of the *Pañcatantra* in South India. As Kālidāsa and Bhāravi are quoted, some of these could have been composed before 600 A.D. There is a *Nepalese* manuscript of the *Pañcatantra* containing only verses with very few prose passages. This is known as *Pañcatantra* in South India and *Pañcākhyānaka* in North India. The *Pañcatantra* has greatly influenced in the writing of the *Śukasaptati* and *Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā*.

The *Hitopadeśa* represents an attempt at the reconstruction of the *Pañcatantra* to suit the needs of the hour. Most of the stories from the *Pañcatantra* are found here. The verses from the *Nītisāra* of *Kāmandaka* are included here. This work has only four sections under the names *Mitralābha*, *Suhṛdbheda*, *Vigraha* and *Sandhi*. The fourth section of the *Pañcatantra* is completely left out. The last section viz., *Sandhi* is created by the author of the *Hitopadeśa* called Nārāyaṇa who was patronised by a certain Dhavalacandra of Bengal. The earliest manuscript of the work is dated 1373 A.D. and so the work must have been composed before this date. There is no evidence to determine its date. The purpose of the work was to teach the sons of Sudarśana, king of Pāṭaliputra and in this respect, it agrees with the *Pañcatantra* meant for the ignorant sons of the king Amaraśakti of Mihilāropya who were to be taught by Viṣṇuśarman. The work is very simple for reading and has many translations in the Indian languages.

The *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa* come under the science of Political Ethics. There must have been some more works of this type, besides these two. Some among them might have been lost and some could have got included within the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*.

The Buddhists and the Jains have their own didactic texts. Siddharṣi, a *Jain* writer, wrote in 906 A.D., the *Upamitibhāvaprapañcakathā* "in which the manifoldness of existence is presented in parable." It is written in prose and verse and contains a number of tales. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) wrote the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, a supplement to his *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*. It has a number of popular tales which the author introduced into his biographical narratives about the *Jain* saints.

———

CHAPTER XXI

SAṀSKṚTA DRAMA—ORIGIN, CHAACTERISTICS AND TYPES

Indian tradition attributes divine origin to the *Saṁskṛta* drama. At the request of the gods who desired to have something which would delight both the ears and eyes of all the created beings, the creator composed the *Nāṭyaveda* taking the element of recitation from the *Ṛgveda*, song from the *Sāmaveda*, gestures from the *Yajurveda* and sentiment from the *Atharvaveda*.[1] Śiva and Pārvatī contributed to the part of dance, the former giving his *tāṇḍava* and the latter her *lāsya*. Viṣṇu brought forth the four dramatic styles called *Kaiśikī*, *Sattvatī*, *Ārabhaṭī* and *Bhāratī*. The sage Bharata was authorised to transfer it to the world and make it popular which he did accordingly. This *Nāṭyaveda* came to be called the fifth *Veda*.

Apart from this account, it is found that the *Saṁskṛta* drama had a religious and secular origin. From the very early days, singing, dancing and the drama were inter-related. The element of singing may be traced to the *Sāmaveda* and dancing and gestures to the performance of the sacred rites which are particularly connected with the *Yajurveda*. The element of dialogues was taken from those contained in the Vedic texts such as those between Yama and Yamī Purūravas and Urvaśī and others. The Vedic rituals contained all the materials necessary for the development of the drama. Still, they could not have by themselves influenced the growth of the drama. The epics and the short narratives provided the dramas with the lyrical element which dominates the *Saṁskṛta* dramas. The epics, which were recited during sacrificial sessions, gave the dramas the element of recitation. The influence of the epics is also seen in the choice of the themes of the dramas taken from them. The influence of the rituals is well noted in the selection of occasions like a religious festival or the worship of a deity when the dramas were staged. Moreover, the dramatic gesture, could not have come into being all of a sudden, for it is in imitation of the events which occur in actual life. The classification of the characters as male and female and as high, middle and low and the division of the languages, used by the characters show that the dramas are based on the occurrences in actual life. All these show that the *Saṁskṛta* drama had its origin in an atmosphere which was both religious and secular. The following stanza from the *Mālavikāgnimitra* may be taken to support this :—

देवानामिदमामनन्ति मुनयः कान्तं क्रतुं चाक्षुषं
रुद्रेणेदमुमाकृतव्यतिकरे स्वाङ्गे विभक्तं द्विधा ।

---

[1] Nāṭyaśāstra I-11 to 17

त्रैगुण्योद्भवमत्र लोकचरितं नानारसं दृश्यते
नाट्यं भिन्नरुचेर्जनस्य बहुधाप्येकं समाराधनम् ।।

Mālavikāgnimitra I-4

The dramas had their beginnings at a time when the epics came to be written.

It is not however possible to ascertain the period when a beginning could have been made to write a dramatic composition. The prevalence of dramatic action and the writing of the dramas could be proved in the early periods by certain evidences. The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini (C.800 B.C.) contains the words *naṭa*, *kuśīlava* and others which have a bearing on the dramatic art.[1] While illustrating the use of verbs to denote incidents in the present time, Patañjali refers to three modes of showing their occurrence, viz., action, painting and recitation. In illustration of this, he mentions the killing of Kaṁsa and the binding of Bāli.[2] The causal use of the verbs here shows that such acts are only practised or gesticulated. This shows that about 150 B.C., the date of Patañjali, dramatic representations were in vogue. In the *Harivaṁśa*, there is a reference to a dramatic representation of the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in which Kṛṣṇa's son played the role of Rāma. The same work mentions Nārada as having imitated in the presence of Indra, the actions of Kṛṣṇa, Balarāma, Arjuna, Satyabhāmā and others.[3] The Buddhistic text *Advadānaśataka* contains references to the dramatic art which shows that the *Saṁskṛta* drama did not have purely a religious origin. The Sitabenga cave near Chota Nagpur contains signs of theatrical representations which prove that before 300 B.C., 'poetry was recited, love-songs were sung and theatrical performances were shown, in those places.' There is no means of knowing what the earliest dramatic compositions are.

Some among the Western scholars suggested the influence of the Greek dramas on the origin and growth of the *Saṁskṛta* drama. The Greek dramas, which were staged in the courts of the Indian kings subsequent to Alexander's invasion, must have influenced the Indian writers in writing the *Saṁskṛta* dramas after their model. This is evident from certain similar features betrayed by the Greek and Indian dramas. Both the Greek and the *Saṁskṛta* dramas are divided into acts which are normally five in number. At the end of each act, the actors depart from the stage. The entry of a new character into the stage is announced by a character already present there. The love-theme is common to both, as also the division of the characters as high, middle and low. The word *yavanikā*, which refers to the curtain in the *Saṁskṛta* drama, shows its connection with the word *yavana* referring to the Greeks. The *Yavana* maidens were employed by the Indian kings as their body-guards.

The above points of coincidences between the Greek and the *Saṁskṛta* dramas do not prove the influence of the former over the

---

1. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4-3-110 2. *Mahābhāṣya* 3-1-26 3. Harivaṁśa II 88&91

latter. The technical parts of the dramas in both the countries should have risen quite independently. The details there could have risen out of necessity peculiar to the occasion. The choice of the love theme and the division of the characters reflect the atmosphere prevailing in the Indian courts then and actual life respectively. The word '*yavanikā*' refers to the *Persian* tapestry, the material out of which the curtain was made. There are also strong grounds for rejecting the *Greek* influence. The *Saṁskṛta* dramas do not know the three unities of the *Greek* dramas. Above all these, the Indian dramatists do not have the tragedy which is a characterestic feature of the *Greek* dramas. The *Saṁskṛta* dramas do not also appear to have been influenced by the *Greek* dramas.

It has been suggested that in India, the drama arose from the rude pantomime, this being supported by the word *sūtradhāra* used in the sense of the stage-manager and which also means one who holds the threads (*sūtra*) connecting the puppets. It must however be said that the puppet-play is only in imitation of the dramatic art which is based on the actions of the human beings. Hence there is no sense in this suggestion. "The drama as comedy is a national expression of man's primitive life of pleasure and appreciation of humour and wit and it cannot therefore wait to be evolved from the puppet or shadow-shows."

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES

The dramatic representation (*nāṭya*) consists in the imitation of a condition or state in life (अवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यम्) or of an occurrence happening in the world (लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यम्).
The purpose of such representations is set forth thus by Bharata :—

उत्तमाधममध्यानां नराणां कर्मसंश्रयम् ।
हितोपदेशजननं धृतिक्रीडासुखादिकृत् ॥
दु:खार्थानां समर्थानां शोकार्तानां तपस्विनाम् ।
विश्रान्तिजननं काले नाट्यमेतन्मया कृतम् ॥

Nāṭyaśāstra I-114-115

The dramatic representation is to be based on the activities of people of three types high, middle and low. It must give people good instructions and provide them with cheerfulness, pastime and pleasure. It must afford rest and diversion at the proper hour to those who are afflicted with misery and grief, those who are efficient and fit to work, those who are affected by sorrow and those who are helpless and require to be pitied. These being the ulterior motives, the dramas have to deal with all those events that would serve the intended purpose. All these show that the *Saṁskṛta* drama is based on actual life and therefore has the realistic touch.

The purpose to be served by the dramatic representation had a particular effect on the growth and development of the *Saṁskṛta* drama. In order to provide the audience with rest and diversion, the grim realities in actual life had to be left out unrecorded, since their representation would fill the mind of the persons disappointed in life and afflicted with sorrow with a gloomy picture resulting in the aggravation of their mental torment. The purpose of witnessing the dramatic representation would not have been served for the audience. Hence an idealistic approach is found in the matter of representing those scenes. By depicting such scenes as having a happy end, hopes are sought to be instilled in the minds of the sufferers. This is what Bharata means by हितोपदेशजननम्. At the same time, steps are taken to serve the needs of those who are carefree in life, or not afflicted with actual misery, by providing them with scenes full of mirth and joy, so that such people can enjoy them and be happy. As these aspects of dramatic representation were taken into consideration, the *Saṁskṛta* dramas are idealistic to a slight degree but are not far removed from real life.

To serve the intended purposes stated above, the *Saṁskṛta* drama had to avoid certain actions in life such as fighting, death, sleep, love in union, pronouncement of the curse etc. The effect on the audience of the representation of scenes in which these are to occur can easily be imagined. The principle of Hindu ethics namely virtue must triumph over vice does not permit a hero noble in his qualities fall down and meet with disaster nor does it allow a rival who must necessarily be wicked be shown in glorious colours without having to suffer for his deeds. The scenes where such a rival is shown to meet with an inglorious end are also not shown, for after all, he is only reaping what he has sown. This too shall be easily imagined. Therefore his fall is not tragic. More than the purposes of the dramatic representations, it is the aesthetic sense that has played much against the introduction of the scenes mentioned above. This does not mean that in the drama, there is no reference at all to these scenes. They are all indicated indirectly through references made to them in the conversations of the characters. Such scenes are found in the *Veṇīsaṁhāra*, *Nāgānanda*, *Uttararāmacarita* and others.

Direct representation of these scenes is avoided by giving an idealistic picture of the events concerned, avoiding or averting them by introducing supernatural devices like the presentation of celestial beings on the spot of occurrence or their messengers. To the Indian mind, believing in the omnipresence of God, free movements of the celestial beings and relying upon the grace of gods who would rather abruptly interfere in the case of emergency into the daily life of those devoted to them than be passive witnesses of their sufferings, the introduction of supernatural element is not meaningless or unjustifiable. The polished souls have been able to compel their favourite deities make their appearance before them in times of dire distress. Such occurrences, though few in number, have given consolation to the other unhappy selves. It is to instil hope in the minds of the disappointed, that supernatural devices were adopted and that too, when normal means could not bring about the intended result. Hence the

the *Saṁskṛta* dramas are not divided into comedies and tragedies, as the Western dramas. This explains the absence of the tragedy in the *Saṁskṛta* dramas.

The *Saṁskṛta* dramas differ from the *Greek* dramas in another respect also and that is, they do not observe the unities of time and place recognised by the latter. The unity of time is not known to the Indian dramatists either in the duration for the dramatic representation of a play being the same as that required for its actual occurrence or in maintaining at least one night's interval between any two acts of the play. The events in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Vikramorvaśīya* and *Uttararāmacarita* cover a period of many years. The second act in the *Uttararāmacarita* is separated from the first act by an interval of twelve years. Nor is the unity of place observed by the Indian dramatists. The scenes in the *Abijñānaśākuntala* and in the *Vikramorvaśīya* are laid in the sites of the forests and penance groves, in cities and in heaven. The unity of plot however is given importance in the *Saṁskṛta* dramas, *e.g.*, the plays of Kālidāsa and Śūdraka.

The passage in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata

नानाभावोपसंपन्नं नानावस्थान्तरात्मकम् ।
लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यमेतन्मया कृतम् ।।

I-112

brings out clearly the importance of emotion (*bhāva*) in the dramatic representation. When it is mentioned by Bharata that the dramatic representation is intended to give good advice to people, to provide them with diversion, sport etc., it is suggested that people who witness a dramatic performance are to enjoy it. Enjoyment consists in having the personal experience or feeling that is pleasurable and which rises about the incident or scene. The rise of a mental feeling or emotion is at the basis for such an enjoyment. The individual who witnesses the dramatic performance has therefore an emotion aroused in him leading to rest, diversion, pastime or pleasure. To give rise to such an emotion, the dramatic performances are conducted with the aid of *nṛtya* in which emotional appeal dominates and *nṛtta* which is marked by musical time. The dramatic representation therefore includes these two and is mainly dependent on the sentiment (*rasa*) for its success.

Vide :—धीरोदात्ताद्यवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यं रसाश्रयम् ।
भावाश्रयं तु नृत्यं स्यान्नृत्तं तालयान्वितम् ।।

Pratāparudrīya—Nāṭakaprakaraṇa 1-2

The sentiments developed through the dramatic representation may be varied but a man of taste (*sahṛdaya*) would idealise it and derive aesthetic delight therefrom. The dramatist has therefore to choose and develop those factors which would be conducive to the heightening of this *rasa* aspect and avoid those which would hinder that.

Besides music and dancing which are necessary for this purpose, the verse form is better suited to develop sentiment than prose. Hence the *Saṁskṛta* dramas abound in a number of lyrical stanzas. The *Abhijñānaśākuntala* has about 192 lyrical stanzas, *Vikramorvaśīya* 133, *Uttararāmacarita* 255, *Mṛcchakaṭika* 380 and *Veṇīsaṁhāra* 208. These stanzas describe generally the emotions and the particular situations. Nature, which serves as a very helpful background for depicting emotions, is very often described in the dramas. For purposes of developing sentiment, four dramatic styles (*vṛtti*) are adopted according to the nature of sentiment, type of drama and hero. They are *Kaiśikī* (graceful), *Sāttvatī* (grand), *Ārabhaṭī* (violent) and *Bhāratī* (verbal). The literary manner (of writing) that is, *rīti* and the figures of speech add much to the successful display of the sentiment. Prose which is used in dialogues is not given much prominence, as the dialogues help more in developing action than sentiment. Dramatic action is given only secondary importance. However, due share is given to the dialogues in the dramas of Kālidāsa, Śudraka, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, Viśākhadatta and others. To some extent, the proper place of verses and prose came to be ignored by the later dramatists. Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* is more a lyrical poem than a drama. His *Mālatīmādhava* has some unduly long prose passages. Murāri's *Anargharāghava*, Rājaśkehara's *Bālarāmāyaṇa* and Jayadeva's *Prasannarāghava* have more of undramatic stanzas. It is therefore said that the *Saṁskṛta* dramas are idealistic and they came to be read. When judged in the light of the purpose intended to be served by the dramatic representation, this charge cannot be sustained and these plays are to be judged from the conditions under which they were written.

The theme (*itivṛtta*) of a play may be based on the traditional source, on the imagination of the dramatist and on an admixture of both. The epics and *Upākhyānas* have supplied much material for the dramatists. Although such themes have to come under the first kind, yet they are changed generally by the dramatist to suit his own purpose. The *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Vikramorvaśīya*, *Veṇīsaṁhāra* and others illustrate this. Very few dramatists have invented a theme with success. The *Mālatīmādhava* shall serve to illustrate this. The *Mālavikāgnimitra* and the *Mṛcchakaṭika* shall come under the last category and treated as historical plays to some extent. Generally, the dramas are based on love-themes, as is found in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. The *Nāgānanda* of Harṣavardhana has a theme based on universal benevolence. The *Mudrārākṣasa* is a political drama. Some among the other types of dramas like *Prakaraṇa*, *Prahasana*, *Bhāṇa* and *Vīthī* are social plays dealing with occurrences that take place among oridnary people while others concern themselves with royal houses. Generally, an intricate plot is not attempted as it would hinder the development of sentiment.

Next to the plot, the characters come to occupy importance in the *Saṁskṛta* dramas. The division of the characters into male and female and into high, middle, and low imparts reality to the plays. "In this connection it is worth noting that Indian producers anticipated the West by some thirteen hundred years in permitting the women to play female parts."[1] The restriction in the use of a particular language or dialect is based on what is obtained in life. Among the male characters, the hero is of high importance. His qualities are extolled and is never allowed to suffer at the hands of the rival. The heroes are of four types, viz., *Dhīrodātta*, *Dhīroddhata*, *Dhīralalita* and *Dhīraśānta*. As lovers, they are of four types, viz., *Anukūla*, *Dakṣiṇa*, *Dhṛṣṭa* and *Śaṭha*. Next to the hero, the *Vidūṣaka* plays a useful part in the drama. He is a Brahmin, foolish and a *narmasaciva*. He talks in *Prākṛta*. Among the women characters, the heroine occupies an important place. Some rivals are introduced to the heroine attempting to share the love of the hero. Very often the rival woman is only one. By introducing her, the dramatist is in a position to depict the character of the women by comparison and contrast. All women characters speak in *Prākṛta* but there are some exceptions. Paṇḍita Kauśikī in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and Kāmandakī in the *Mālatīmādhava* are highly respected characters using *Saṁskṛta*. The larger number of the dramas belonging to the *Nāṭaka* type and the love-plot that is common to many among them made the Western scholars characterise the *Saṁskṛta* drama as lacking in effective characterisation. It is often said that in the drama, there is no individuality of character and that there are no individuals but only types. Once again it must be said that characters occupy only a secondary place when compared to the sentiment. The authors of the *Nāṭakas* have to follow certain rules in the creation of characters as laid down in the works on dramaturgy. Therefore, it appears that there are types of characters. A study of the characters in the dramas of Kālidāsa, Śūdraka, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa and Viśākhadatta reveals how effectively had these dramatists presented their characters and maintained their individuality. It must be admitted that characterisation suffered at the hands of some of the later dramatists.

A drama begins generally with a benediction (*nāndī*). The recitation of this marks the end of the observance of certain preliminary ceremonies called *Pūrvaraṅga* performed behind the curtain. The stage manager enters the stage after *nāndī* is recited. In some plays, he enters the stage and recites it. He then engages himself in a talk with his wife (*naṭī*), *vidūśaka*, or friend (*pāripārśvika*) and makes references to the title and author of the drama. He leaves the stage with his members after announcing the arrival of a character on the stage. This portion is called by the titles *Prastāvanā*, *Āmukha* or *Sthāpanā*. The scenes involving the presentation of death, fight etc. and those difficult and unnecessary in the context are avoided and the information about them is conveyed through five devices, viz., *Viṣkambha*, *Praveśaka*, *Cūlikā*, *Aṅkāvatāra* and *Aṅkāsya*. The first two are in the form of conversation between two or more characters. The first one is pure (*śuddha*) when middle characters speaking *Saṁskṛta* take part and is mixed (*miśra*) when low characters also using *Prākṛta* take part. The second device, which is not to be allowed in the first act of the play, is only in *Prākṛta*, the low characters taking part in it. The *Cūlikā* connects any two acts through a speech made behind the curtain. The *Aṅkāvatāra* is indicated by the absence of the characters at the beginning of an act thus showing it to be in continuation of the previous one. The *Aṅkāsya* makes a reference to what follows in the succeeding act through the characters of the previous act. There are certain stage directions like *apavārya*, *ātmagatam*, *janāntikam* and others which permit the actors on the stage speak to one or two among themselves leaving the other actors, in a way audible only to the audience. A character is made to enter the stage in the course of an act his entry having been announced by the character already present on the stage. Sometimes a character enters the stage by a toss of the curtain, thereby showing the urgency of his entry. Certain devices are also adopted to further the progress of the plot, *e.g.*, writing love-letters, painting the figures of the lovers, dance, play within a play and others. Interchange of the male and female roles is also allowed. The introduction of supernatural element brings about a happy ending in some dramas. In some dramas, semi-divine beings take part. Every drama ends with the *Bharatavākya* uttered, by way of benediction, by the hero or any other prominent character in the drama.

---

[1] C.E.M. Joad : The History of Indian civilisation p. 95

A drama is divided into acts. At the end of each act, the actors leave the stage. There is no restriction regarding the number of acts or actors. The number of acts varies from one to ten. The *Abhijñānaśākuntala* has thirty actors, *Veṇīsamhāra* thrity-two, *Mṛcchakaṭika* twenty-nine, *Mudrārākṣasa* twenty-four, *Vikramorvaśīya* eighteen, *Mālatīmādhava* thirteen and *Uttararāmacarita* ten.

Bharata speaks of theatrical arrangements. He gives details regarding the measurements for building the play-houses which are of three different kinds.[1] More information is contained about this in the *Bhāvaprakāśana* of Śāradātanaya. There were play-houses, art galleries and others called by the names *Prekṣāgṛha*, *Citraśālā*, *Saṁgītaśālā etc.*

As the *Saṁskṛta* drama is in imitation of a condition in life and not of action in life, there are frequent references to the stage directions like gesticulating (*nāṭayitvā*). The actors merely imitate what one will do in actual life. Actions like mounting the chariot, watering the plants, hunting and others are left to be imagined by the audience. The curtain, which remains as the background throughout the performance, provides for the audience an occasion for conceiving the beauties of nature. The cultured audience could easily follow what takes place on the stage. The difficulty of procuring elaborate details on the stage should have given rise to the simple scenic arrangements on the stage. To the trained minds who expect in the drama perfect treatment of sentiment, this must have been of little consequence. The critics would not permit in the drama anything that is likely to disturb the mental condition of the audience.

---

[1] *Nāṭyaśāstra* ch. II

TYPES OF THE DRAMA

The literary compositions are of two types, viz., *śravya* and *dṛśya.* The former refers to the compositions which are read out and so are poems, prose and others. The latter refers to those which are seen on the stage when represented and so the dramas are meant by this. The dramas are also called by the name *Rūpaka* as what they contain is represented by actors taking particular roles. The *Rūpakas* are of ten kinds :—

नाटकं सप्रकरणं भाणः प्रहसनं डिमः ।
व्यायोगसमवाकारौ वीथ्यंकेहामृगा दश ॥

Among them, the *Nāṭaka* is based on the theme already available, has the king as the hero, the queen as the heroine and has five to ten acts. The main sentiment shall be *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra.* Kālidāsa's *Abhijñānaśākuntala* and Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's *Veṇīsaṁhāra* illustrate this type. Invented theme, anyone other than prince being a hero, and any woman including a courtesan being the heroine are the features of the *Prakaraṇa.* The number of acts shall be ten. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* serves as an illustration of the *Prakaraṇa* in which the courtesan is the herione and the *Mālatīmādhava* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka* illustrate it the heroine therein being an ordinary housewife. The *Bhāṇa* is an one-act play dealing with the life of a rogue. *Vīra* or *śṛṅgāra* shall be the main sentiment. The theme shall be an invented one. It is in the form of a monologue. Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa's *Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabhāṇa* illustrates this. The *Prahasana* is an one-act play in which comic element dominates. Heretics, servants, libertines and degraded persons take part in it. Mahendravikraman's *Mattavilāsaprahasana* represents this type. The *Dima* has four acts describing the magic feats of supernatural beings. Gods, demons, semi-divine beings and others take part in it. The plot is based on the traditional lore. The main sentiment shall be anyone among the eight except love and comic. This is represented by Vatsarāja's *Tripuravijaya.* The *Vyāyoga* is in one act with a traditional plot and a boasting hero. The dominant sentiment shall be love or comic. It shall contain battle-scenes which do not rise on account of woman. The events dealt with here shall be such as to cover a day for their occurrence. Viśvanātha's *Saugandhikāharaṇa* illustrates this. The *Samavākāra* has three acts and is based on the traditional theme. Battle-scenes shall form the subject-matter. The heroes who shall be gods and demons shall be twelve in number each one achieving a different purpose. They shall be haughty and well-known. The main sentiment shall be *vīra*. The events of the first act shall cover nine hours in actual life, those in the second three hours and those in the last one hour and a half.[1] This is represented by the *Samudramathana* of Vatsarāja. The *Vīthī* is an one-act play with two or three actors. Love shall be the main sentiment. Ravipati's *Premābhirāma* represents this type. The *Aṅka* is an one-act play with a traditional plot. *Karuṇa* shall be the main sentiment. Ordinary men shall be the heroes. Wordy exchanges and merriment of women shall form its subject-matter. This is represented by the *Unmattarāghava* of Bhāskara. The *Ihāmṛga* has four acts with a plot of mixed type. The mortal and the divine being shall be the hero and the rival respectively. They shall be haughty and desire to carry a (celestial) lady by force. The battle shall end without any one being killed. The sentiment shall be the semblance of love (*Śṛṅgārābhāsa*). This is represented by Vatsarāja's *Rukmiṇīharaṇa*.

There are *Uparūpakas* or dramas secondary in form and nature. Among the eighteen kinds of them, the *Nāṭikā*, *Saṭṭaka*, *Troṭaka* and *Prekṣaṇaka* are well-known. The *Nāṭikā* shall have a plot mixed in nature. The hero is of the *dhīralalita* type. *Śṛṅgāra* is the main sentiment. It shall contain four acts. There shall be more women characters than men characters. Harṣavardhana's *Ratnāvalī* represents this type. The *Saṭṭaka* is identical with the *Nāṭikā* except in the language being completely *Prākṛta* and not having any *praveśaka*. Each act shall be called *Yavanikā* or *Javanikā*. Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* illustrates this type. The *Troṭaka* shall have five, seven, eight or nine acts. It shall be based on the activities of divine and mortal beings. The *Vidūṣaka* shall make his appearance in each act. Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya* is cited as an illustration for this. It is not known how this drama came to be treated as a *Troṭaka*, as the *Vidūṣaka* does not make his appearance in the I and IV acts. The *Prekṣaṇaka* is an one-act play without the stage manager, in which the duel is dealt with. Activities of a degraded hero are treated. It shall be without *praveśaka* and *viṣkambha*. This is represented by the *Vālivadha*.

The definitions of the *Rūpaka* and *Uparūpaka* types must have been based on the dramatic compositions available then. Of these, the *Nāṭaka*, *Prakaraṇa*, *Prahasana*, *Bhāṇa* and *Nāṭikā* have been more popular than other types. Even here, the *Nāṭaka* has been the only kind that attracted the audience and the critics. This is evident from the largest number of plays belonging to the *Nāṭaka* type and the few plays representing the other types.

---

[1] *Pratāparudrīya—Nāṭakaprakaraṇa* 49

CHAPTER XXII

BHASA AND KALIDASA

The standard of perfection attained and maintained by Kālidāsa as a dramatist presupposes the existence of a number of dramatic compositions before him. Kālidāsa mentions, in the *prastāvanā* of his play *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Bhāsa, Saumilla and Kaviputra and others as writers of repute. The names and works of his predecessors other than these three have been lost. The same thing had happened in the case of the works of these three writers.

Bhāsa was a predecessor of Kālidāsa. He is known to have written a number of dramas.[1] However, till recently, Bhāsa was only a name and his plays were lost. The works on rhetorics contained some information about his works. In 1911, some manuscripts were discovered by Gaṇapati Śāstrin. They were thirteen in number in the same bundle and bore some mutual likenesses. Gaṇapati Śāstrin edited them and attributed all of them to the authorship of Bhāsa.

His arguments in support of Bhāsa's authorship could be summed up as follow :—All these plays begin with the arrival of the *sūtradhāra* on the stage and then the *ṇāndī* is recited. This is quite a peculiar feature not found in the dramas of other writers. In the *Harṣacarita*,[2] Bāṇa uses the words सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः नाटकैः while referring to Bhāsa, supporting this trait found in these plays. The prologue is called *Sthāpanā* in these plays while the other well-known plays have the word *prastāvanā* to refer to it. The prologues do not contain any reference to the name of the author and of the work, thereby showing that these plays belong to pre-classical period. In most of these plays, the same expressions occur in the prologue.[3] The Nāndī verse contains the names of the characters in the play concerned thus having the *mudrālaṅkāra*.

Vide :—उदयनवेन्दुसवर्णावासवदत्तावलौ बलस्य त्वाम्।
पद्मावतीर्णपूर्णौ वसन्तकम्रौ भुजौ पाताम् ॥

Svapnavāsavadatta : Nāndī.

Here occur the names of the characters Udayana, Vāsavadattā, Padmāvatī and Vasantaka. The *Bharatavākya* in most of these plays ends with the prayer राजसिंहः प्रशास्तु नः । These plays contain a number of expressions which are incorrect in the light of Pāṇini's grammar, *e.g.*, आपृच्छामि, उपलप्स्यति, द्रक्ष्यते, रक्षते, काशिराज्ञः, सर्वराज्ञः, अलं कर्तुम् etc. On the strength of these similarities found in

---

1. *Mālavikāgnimitra : Prastāvanā*
2. *Harṣacarita :* Introductory stanza 15
3. एवमार्यमिश्रान् विज्ञापयामि, अये किं नु खलु मयि विज्ञापनव्यग्रे शब्द इव श्रूयते ।

common among these plays, the learned editor attributed them to the same author Bhāsa.

Rājaśekhara, the rhetorician, refers to a critical examination conducted for the plays of Bhāsa by the critics and makes the remark that the *Svapnavāsavadatta* stood the test.

Vide :—भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि छेकैः क्षिप्ते परीक्षितुम् ।
स्वप्नवासवदत्तस्य दाहकोऽभून्न पावकः ।।

Kāvyamīmāṁsā

The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra mentions the *Svapnavāsavadatta* as the work of Bhāsa. Bhoja, Śāradātanaya and Sāgaranandin refer to the *Svapnavāsavadatta* without associating the name of Bhāsa with it. The quotations contained in the works on rhetorics are traced to the other plays edited by Gaṇapati Śāstrin. These quotations do not refer to the name of the writer or work from which they are taken. A study of these references reveals that the contents of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* as available from them are almost identical with the contents in the *Svapnanāṭaka*, one of the works discovered and edited. The two plays must therefore be identical with each other. On the strength of similarities which all other plays here bear to the *Svapnavāsavadatta* of Bhāsa, they too should have been written by Bhāsa. Thus are discovered the lost plays of Bhāsa.

Soon after the publication of these plays, called the Thirteen Trivandrum Plays, a host of scholars began to oppose the conclusion arrived at by Gaṇapati Śāstrin. They held that these plays could not be attributed to Bhāsa on the strength of the similarities exhibited by them, as the dramas known to be the productions of writers other than Bhāsa betray these features. The *Svapnanāṭaka*, one of these plays, cannot be identical with the *Svapnavāsavadatta* of Bhāsa. These are only the stage-adaptations of different plays. These must have been prepared by the Cākyars, the actors in Kerala where these have been discovered. The arguments of the critics who opposed the authorship of Bhāsa to these plays could be stated briefly thus. The recitation of the *Nāndī* after the arrival of the *sūtradhāra* on the stage is not a feature peculiar only to these plays. Śūdraka's *Padmaprābhṛtaka*, Iśvaradatta's *Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda*, Vijjaka's *Kaumudīmahotsava*, Mahendravikraman's *Mattavilāsaprahasana*, Kulaśekharavarman's *Subhadrādhanañjaya* and *Tapatīsaṁvaraṇa* and others betray this feature which appears to have been in vogue in the southern part of India.[1] In all these plays, the prologue is called *Sthāpanā* which again shows that this is also a practise peculiar to the region where the plays are written. The peculiar nature of the prologue in these plays in not having any reference to the author or work and containing the common expressions is found in Vararuci's *Ubhayābhisārikā* and others, thereby showing Bhāsa alone could not have been responsible for the introduction of this feature. There is no *mudrālaṅkāra* in the *Nāndī* of the *Avimāraka*, *Madhyamavyāyoga*, *Dūtavākya*, *Dūtaghaṭotkaca*, *Karṇabhāra* and *Bālacarita*, six among the thirteen plays edited by Gaṇapati Śāstrin. From this, it can be concluded that these six plays are of different authorship and therefore could not be attributed to Bhāsa. Similarly, the *Pratimānāṭaka*, *Madhyamavyāyoga*, *Dūtaghaṭotkaca*, *Karṇabhāra* and *Ūrubhaṅga* do not contain the word *rājasiṁha* in the *Bharatavākya*, thereby showing that they are different from the remaining plays in this respect and therefore could not be attributed to Bhāsa's authorship. The expressions, which these plays contain and which are incorrect according to Pāṇini's grammar, do not have the semblance of being archaic or pre-*Pāṇiniyan* forms. They are rather the expressions of the scribes who had no good grounding in grammar. Thus it is seen that neither is there any similarity between all these plays in all respects nor is this supposed similarity confined only to these plays.

---

[1] *Cf.* Sāhityadarpaṇa VI

From the reference made by Rājaśekhara to the dramas of Bhasa, it is known that Bhāsa's *Svapnavāsavadatta* stood the fire of criticism. The quotations given in the *Dhvanyāloka* and *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* are related to the story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā but are not found in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* edited in Trivandrum. Śāradātanaya's references also do not correspond to the contents of the Trivandrum play. Somadevasūri attributes the stanza beginning with the words पेया सुरा to Bhāsa but it is not found in any of the Trivandrum plays. It is found included in the *Mattavilāsaprahasana*.[1] In his commentary on Amarasiṁha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, Sarvānanda classifies *Sṛṅgāra* under *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* and illustrates the last by citing Udayna's marriage with Vāsavadattā as represented in the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. There is absolutely no connection between this reference and the *Svapnavāsavadatta* of Trivandrum. Some of the passages quoted in the works on rhetorics are found not only in the Trivandrum plays but in others as well such as *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*, *Mṛcchakaṭika* and others. Moreover, these quotations are not associated with Bhāsa or any of his plays by naming them.[2] Added to these, eleven stanzas quoted in the anthologies associating them with Bhasa's authorship are not found in any of these thirteen plays. It is also suggested that these thirteen plays could be brought together because of the *Prākṛta* expressions in them betraying similarities but this evidence is of no value, since these very same expressions are found in the *Mattavilāsaprahasana*, *Nāgānanda*, *Subhadrādhanañjaya*, *Tapatīsaṁvaraṇa*, and *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*. The reason for the sameness of the *Prākṛta* expressions in these is that the literary *Prākṛta* became stereotyped in South India and ceased to grow. Hence all these plays are only stage-adaptations of some bigger dramas.

---

[1] *Mattavilāsaprahasana* 7

[2] *Cf. Bālacarita* I 15; *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti* IV-3-25, V-1-3, &V -2-28

Instead of taking sides in this issue, it would be wise to take a moderate view. It is admitted that Bhāsa was a reputed predecessor of Kālidāsa and had a number of dramas to his credit. The remark contained in Act I of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* about the relative greatness of the old and new compositions is to be interpreted as questioning the eminence of Bhāsa and other predecessors. The result of this remark led to a severe criticism of Bhāsa's plays at the hands of the critics. Among the several plays, the *Svapnavāsavadatta* alone stood the test. Thereafter Bhāsa's plays must have been becoming unpopular. An effort might have been taken up by interested writers to modify and improve those plays and abridge them, if they were too long and have them staged in the court of the *Pallava* king Narasiṁhavarman II (680-722 A.D.). The title '*Rājasiṁha*', which this king had, must have been included in the *Bharatavākya* of all the plays then staged on account of his patronage extended to the poets. With the disintegration of the *Pallava* kingdom, the valuable works of art in Kāñcī must have been removed to places of safety like Kerala. That this could have been the case is borne out by some evidences. The stanzas in Bhāsa's plays got included in others' dramas like *Mattavilāsaprahasana*. The *Avantisundarī*, written in Kāñcī by Daṇḍin, has been discovered in Kerala. In all probability, they were further abridged in Kerala.

Since the *Svapnavāsavadatta* alone is mentioned, in the works on rhetorics, as the work of Bhāsa, Bhāsa's authorship of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* cannot be denied. The reference made by Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* about a *Svapnavāsavadatta* is found to agree with a part of the Act V of the Trivandrum edition of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. The stanza quoted by Vāmana in the *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti* is found as stanza 7 in Act IV of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* now in print. However, it seems that the original text must have lost some stanzas quoted by the rhetoricians. For instance, a stanza seems to be missing after the prose passage अहो विचित्रता कुसुमस्य, वसन्तक uttered by the king in Act IV.[1] In all likelihood, the present text of the *Svapnavāsavadatta* is an abridgement of the original. Apart from Bhāsa, there were dramatists who wrote on the story of Udayana *e.g.*, Subandhu, author of the *Vāsavadattānāṭyadhāra*,[2] Anaṅgaharṣa Mātrārāja, the author of the *Tāpasavatsarāja*[3] and others. The *Svapnavāsavadattā* mentioned by Śaradātanaya is perhaps a work different from that ascribed to Bhāsa.

Bhāsa's authorship to the other twelve plays of Trivandrum cannot be admitted as there is no evidence to support it. These plays could have been written by any other writer. Those who argue in favour of Bhāsa's authorship of these plays treat the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka as based on and as improved upon the *Cārudatta*, one of the Trivandrum plays. Unlike the other plays, the *Cārudatta* has an abrupt

---

1. *Svapnavāsavadatta* : *Cf.* IV 2, V 3
2. Abhinavagupta : *Nāṭyavedavivṛti* XII 48
3. ,, *Dhvanyāloka* Uddyota IV

beginning and an abrupt end. It does not have the *Nāndī* and *Bharatavākya*. The *sthāpanā* is quite different from that in the other plays. It is futile to argue in favour of the *Cārudatta* being the basis for the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, when the *Carudatta* is of undecided authorship. That Śūdraka was a poet is known from Vāmana who besides mentioning him quotes passages without associating his name. Some of these passages are found in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* alone and some others in the *Cārudatta* also. It is idle to deny to Śūdraka the authorship for the entire *Mṛcchakaṭika* as the *Cārudatta* has clear traces of being an abridgement of even the first four acts of the former. If Śūdraka is said to have introduced the political plot and made the drama full-fledged, then he, who had that ability, could have easily invented a sub-plot. He would not have borrowed or based his plot on another's drama and thus become a plagiarist. The authorship of Bhāsa for the *Cārudatta* is therefore to be dismissed.

Bhāsa could have lived a century before Kālidāsa, that is, in the second century B.C. Apart from this reference in the drama of Kālidāsa, there is no evidence to fix his date.

The thirteen plays attributed to Bhāsa are :—(*a*) based on the *Mahābhārata*: *Pañcarātra*, *Dūtavākya*, *Madhyamavyāyoga*, *Dūtaghaṭotkaca*, *Karṇabhāra* and *Ūrubhaṅga*. (*b*) based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*: *Pratimānāṭaka*, *Abhiṣekanāṭaka*; (*c*) based on the *Bhāgavata*: *Bālacarita* and (*d*) based on the fables : *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*, *Svapnavāsavadatta*, *Cārudatta*, and *Avimāraka*.

Among these plays, the *Pañcarātra* is a *Samavākāra* in three acts showing how Duryodhana kept his word to Droṇa that he would give the due share in the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas, if they were found out within five days. The *Dūtavākya* is a *Vyāyoga* in one act dealing with Kṛṣṇa's role as an ambassador of the Pāṇḍavas. It contains no *Prākṛta* passage. The *Madhyamavyāyoga* is in one act showing how Bhīma became united with his son Ghaṭotkaca. The *Dūtaghaṭotkaca* is a *vyāyoga* in one act showing the part played by Ghaṭotkaca as a messenger of Kṛṣṇa sent to the Kauravas. The *Karṇabhāra* in one act glorifies the sense of responsibility of Karṇa who parted with his coat of mail and ear-rings and gave them to Indra who approached him in the guise of a Brahmin. The *Ūrubhaṅga* in one act depicts Bhīma breaking the thigh of Duryodhana. Here death is depicted on the stage.

The *Pratimānāṭaka*, in seven acts, depicts the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* beginning from the stopping of Rāma's coronation and ending with his coronation after Rāvaṇa was slain. The statues of the departed members in the royal family including that of Daśaratha serve as a means to inform Bharata of his father's demise. Hence the title of the play, The *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* is in six acts depicting the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* from the death of Vālin up to Rāma's coronation in Ayodhyā. Indrajit is shown to have been slain by Rāma. Vālin's death is shown on the stage.

The *Bālacarita*, in five acts, describes Kṛṣṇa's birth and exploits. Kṛṣṇa is mentioned as the seventh child of Vasudeva. The erotic element which is found in later works in connection with Kṛṣṇa's sports is absent here. On the stage are shown the fight between Ariṣṭa and Kṛṣṇa and the deaths of Ariṣṭa, and Kaṁsa. The third act has a scene showing the *Hallīśa* dance.

The *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* and *Svapnvāsavadatta* could be better considered as plays based on actual events than as fables. The characters are historical personages. The former play has four acts and the latter six acts. In the prologue of the former, it is referred to as a *Prakaraṇa*. It is not clear whether the two plays were originally a single drama with ten acts. The *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* depicts the vow taken by Yaugandharāyaṇa to set free his master Udayana from imprisonment. The latter play deals with the strategem of Yaugandharāyaṇa to get back the territories of Udayana which he lost owing to his negligence. Vāsavadattā is reported to have perished in a wild conflagration. Padmāvatī, the sister of king Darśaka, is married to Udayana. Vāsavadattā was all along living in cognito with Padmāvatī. Udayana has a vision of Vāsavadattā in dream and feels hopeful of meeting her alive. Reunion is at last effected by the wise minister. On the stage is presented the scene of the king's sleep.

The *Cārudatta* in four acts is an abridgement of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. The *Avimāraka* is a play in six acts depicting the secret love of a prince Avimāraka for a princess Kuraṅgī. The prince killed a demon who came in the form of a sheep (*avi*) and hence his name.

Recently a play with the name *Yajñaphala* was discovered and its authorship is attributed to Bhāsa, as it betrays the features found in the Trivandrum plays. It has seven acts dealing with the sacrifice performed by Daśaratha to get a son. The last act is called *Nirvahaṇāṅka*.

Bhāsa appears to have drawn upon the epic stories and contemporary occurrences for writing the plays. The case of the *Daridracārudatta* may be a case of exception. He had introduced changes in the themes inorder to heighten the characters of some persons who are condemned for their behaviour. The *Pañcarātra* and *Pratimānāṭaka* shall be cited here in which the characters of Duryodhana and Kaikeyī are respectively ennobled. Due credit is to be given to Bhāsa for introducing the statues in the *Pratimānāṭaka* and sleep of Udayana in the *Svapnavāsavadattā*. The sentiment heroic or love is not treated to perfection. In diction and dramatic technique, Bhāsa is inferior to Kālidāsa. Exits and entrances are sometimes abrupt and unnatural. His language, though simple, lacks the sweetness and grace of Kālidāsa's style. Sometimes it is not only crude but ambiguous in import.[1] The glaring incorrect expressions must be attributed to those who have been responsible for handing them down to posterity.

---

1. *Cf. Pratimānāṭaka* I 9, IV 8

Bhāsa appears to have been a devout worshipper of Viṣṇu from the choice of the themes for his plays.[1] Among the admirers of Bhāsa, Bāṇa and Daṇḍin deserve to be mentioned.

Vide :—सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः नाटकैर्बहुभूमिकैः ।
सपताकैर्यशोलेभे भासो देवकुलैरिव ॥

Harṣacarita : Introductory stanza 15

The word '*patākā*' stands for indicating the impending event through a character not directly connected with it. Bāṇa means here that Bhāsa's plays contain *patākāsthāna*.[2] Daṇḍin fancies that Bhāsa is alive through his dramas.

Vide :—सुविभक्तमुखाद्यङ्गैर्व्यक्तलक्षणवृत्तिभिः ।
परेतोऽपि स्थितो भासः शरीरव नाटकैः ॥

Avantisundarī : Introductory stanza 11

It is unfortunate that none of the plays of Bhāsa has come down intact nor could those which are available be attributed to his authorship without facing contradiction. Some among those that are available may be his and those that are his have not seen yet the light of the day. There is a tradition which makes him the author of a treatise on dramaturgy which however is not available.

Identity of Saumilla and Kaviputra mentioned as famous dramatists by Kālidāsa in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* cannot be ascertained. Rāmila and Somila are the alternate readings for the names of these two writers. Rājaśekhara refers to a *Śūdrakakathā* ascribing its authorship to Rāmila and Somila. Even this work is not available

KĀLIDĀSA

Kālidāsa is the author of three plays *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Vikramorvaśīya* and *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. Besides these and the poems, he is known to have written a work called *Kunteśvaradautya*. The nature of the composition is not known, as it is not available now.

Kālidāsa wrote the three plays mentioned above in the order in which they are enumerated. The first drama shows him aspiring for fame and therefore he did not tolerate Bhāsa and others being praised. The second play represents him as one who has earned a name and making an appeal to the critics with his play.[3] The third play represents him as very modest and awaiting for the verdict of the critics notwithstanding the name he has won.[4]

The *Mālavikāgnimitra* is a drama in five acts dealing with the love of Agnimitra, son of Puṣyamitra, for a princess Mālavikā. It may be considered to be a historical play, as contemporaneous events like the horse sacrifice performed by Puṣyamitra, feud between Yajñasena and Mādhavasena and Agnimitra's intervention in the feud are referred to. The *Vikramorvaśīya* is also in five acts depicting the love of king Purūravas for the celestial nymph Urvaśī. The sources of this play could be traced to the *Ṛgveda*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, *Padmapurāṇa*, and *Matsyapurāṇa*. Kālidāsa has introduced several changes there. Act IV is a lyrical monologue depicting Purūravas as a mad man searching for Urvaśī in the mountainous regions. The title विक्रमोर्वशीयम् is to be explained as विक्रमेण लब्धा उर्वशी विक्रमोर्वशी and तामधिकृत्य कृतो ग्रन्थः। It means the play about Urvāśī who was won by Purūravas by the display of his valour. The rhetoricians bring this under the *Troṭaka* type of *Uparūpakas*. The absence of *Vidūṣaka* in Act I and IV does not support this. The text of the drama as commented by Raṅganātha contains a number of *Prākṛta* passages in Act IV. Sahajanyā and Citralekhā the celestial nymphs are introduced and along with the king, they dance and sing. These passages are definitely interpolated, as the presence of them is not known to many Indian commentators. It is ridiculous to make the hero speak in *Prākṛta* now and then revert to *Saṁskṛta*, however mad he might have been. These passages contain vague allusions which are meaningless and convey only what the preceding or following *Saṁskṛta* passages do.

---

[1] *Cf. Pṛthvīrājavijaya* I 8

[2] *Cf.* : *Pañcarātra* II 19
Abhiṣekanāṭaka V 11

[3] *Vikramorvaśīya* I 2

[4] *Abhijñānaśākuntala* I 2

The *Abhijñānaśākuntala* is a drama in seven acts depicting the love of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. The episode *Śakuntalopākhyāna* in the *Mahābhārata* is the basis for the play. By introducing the ring of Duṣyanta and the curse of Durvāsas, Kālidāsa has changed the course of the play in an altogether different direction. Since the loss of the ring given by the hero to the heroine as a token of remembrance (*abhijñāna*) plays a leading part in ennobling the characters of the hero and heroine, the play came to be called as *Abhijñānaśākuntala*.

In the creation of scenes of sustained interest, Kālidāsa displays a skill of a very high order. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the *Vidūṣaka*, Paṇḍita Kauśikī and Bakulāvalikā contribute much to the quick movement of the plot. In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, the scenes of the lover's meeting and the king's search for Urvaśī are well devised. There is not a scene in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* which is devoid of charm and attraction. It used to be said that the fourth act of this play is most attractive and even there four *ślokas* are the best.[1]

Vide :—काव्येषु नाटकं रम्यं तत्र रम्यं शकुन्तला ।
तत्रापि च चतुर्थोङ्कः तत्र श्लोकचतुष्टयम् ।।

Some hold that Act V is more charming than Act IV.

Vide :—शाकुन्तलचतुर्थोङ्कः सर्वोत्कृष्ट इति प्रथा ।
न सर्वसंमता यस्मात्पंचमोस्ति ततोधिकः ।।

---

[1] *Abhijñānaśākuntala* IV 6, 9, 17 & 18

There is gradual development in characterisation from the sensuous Agnimitra to the valiant Purūravas and from him to the heroic Duṣyanta. The noble and dignified Dhāriṇī, the irate and passionate Irāvatī and the innocent Mālavikā are presented together as rivals in love. Their characters are well-depicted. Agnimitra's character does not rise high, although he is very great as an administrator. Purūravas is represented as running after a celestial lady, not being content with his lot in the world. Such unbridled love leads inevitably to madness. Kālidāsa has ably drawn the contrast between Urvasī lacking in maternal affection and Kāśīrājaputrī who gives a free hand to her incorrigible husband in his love affairs. Duṣyanta too is much-married but with remarkable aesthetic sense, the dramatist does not bring the chief queen and Śakuntalā together on the stage. The hero is made to feel that physical and personal love is inferior to spiritual love. He is made to long for a son and then the reunion is effected between the lovers.

Love is the dominant sentiment in all the three plays. Kālidāsa's conception of love and of the limitations to be observed by lovers is very high.[1] It is the harem atmosphere that must have prompted the dramatist who enjoyed royal patronage to choose only love-themes for his plays. The purpose must have been to enlighten the princes that love gets fulfilled in the birth of a child and that through women, their characters get ennobled. Therefore, the women characters are more appealing than his men characters. It is not as if Kālidāsa did not realise the importance of heroism or pathos. He gave them secondary importance. Heroism and pathos had no scope in the courts where peace and plenty prevailed. The same must be said of the women characters in the poems such as Pārvatī, Sītā, Sudakṣiṇā Yakṣī and others.

Kālidāsa employs the *Vidūṣaka* in all the three dramas for serving different purposes. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the *Vidūṣaka* is an amusement companion and a minister in charge of love (*narmasaciva*). The entire interest in the drama centres around him. In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, he is not so clever and commits mistakes which however help the development of the plot. In the third drama, he is shown to be clever and vain. It is his absence on certain occasions that helps the progress of the plot. He is not represented to have met Śakuntalā even once. Much skill is displayed by the dramatist even in portraying the two pupils of Kaṇva and the two companions of Śakuntalā.

Kālidāsa's style in the poems as well as the dramas is easy flowing, chaste and elegant, the like of which is not to be met with any where in the *Saṁskṛta* literature. It is absolutely free from elaborate and laboured constructions. Words are chosen in large numbers from common usage but more words than are absolutely necessary are never used. The style is concise and highly suggestive. The verses are free from long compounds. The dialogues in the dramas are short and simple. His language does not admit of any alteration. The definition of *śayyā*[1], the mode of formation of words in a manner not to admit of any subsequent alteration, applies to his language. Kālidāsa is a master of *Vaidarbhī* style.

---

[1] *Mālavikāgnimitra* III 15
Abhijñānaśākuntala V 24

Vide :—वाल्मीकेरजनि प्रकाशितगुणा व्यासेन लीलावती ।
वैदर्भी कविता स्वयं वृतवती श्रीकालिदासं वरम् ।।
वैदर्भीरीतिसन्दर्भे कालिदासः प्रगल्भते ।

His study of the human mind in the hour of trials is remarkable. He is at his best in depicting the various aspects of love and in describing Nature and its influence on lovers.

Vide :—एकोऽपि जीयते हन्त कालिदासो न केनचित् ।
शृङ्गारे ललितोद्गारे कालिदासत्रयी किमु ।

His choice of appropriate similies brought him the coveted reputation expressed in उपमा कालिदासस्य. His employment is equally perfect with other figures of speech. One outstanding feature which marks him as the greatest poet is his interest in developing the sentiment to perfection without allowing it to be overshadowed by the display of his skill in the use of rare metres and figures of speech. The latter are only aids for the successful delineation of sentiment.[2] Hence we do not come across high flights of imagination bordering the region of mere idealism. 'The harmony of the poetic sentiment is nowhere disturbed by anything violent or terrifying. Every passion is softened without being enfeebled. The ardour of love never goes beyond aesthetic bounds; it never maddens to wild jealousy or hate. The torments of sorrow are toned down to a profound and touching melancholy. It was here at last that the Indian genius found the law of moderation in poetry, which it hardly knew elsewhere, and thus produced works of enduring beauty.'[3]

Kālidāsa's eminence as a writer has been admitted by all Indian writers and Western scholars. Even the list of these writers would become too long to be given here. The opinions of Bāṇa, Daṇḍin and Jayanta deserve to be cited here.

निर्गतासु न वा कस्य कालिदासस्य सूक्तिषु ।
प्रीतिर्मधुरसान्द्रासु मंजरीष्विव जायते ।।
Harṣacarita : Introductory stanza **16**

लिप्ता मधुद्रवेणासन् यस्य निर्विवशा गिरः ।
तेनेदं वर्त्म वैदर्भं कालिदासेन शोधितम् ।।
Avantisundarī: Introductory stanza 15

---

[1] याप दर्नां परान्योन्यमैत्री शय्येति कथ्यते ।
Pratāparudrīya-Kāvyaprakaraṇa

[2] Act IV 8 is composed in imitation of the Vedic hymn.

[3] A.A. Macdonell : A History of Sanskrit Literature p. 353

अमृतेनेव संसिक्ताः चन्दनेनेव चर्चिताः ।
चन्द्रांशुभिरिवोद्घृष्टाः कालिदासस्य सूक्तयः ॥

Nyāyamañjarī I P. 215

Among the writers of the West, the German poet Goethe went into raptures on reading the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. His appreciation is contained in the following lines :

Would'st thou the young year's blossoms
and the fruits of its decline,
And all by which the soul is charmed,
enraptured, feasted, fed,
Would'st thou the Earth and Heaven itself
in one sole name combine ?
I name thee, O Sakuntala ! and all at once is said.

Of Śākuntala, it is said: 'Vivid and beautiful, it achieves elegance without loss of strength and eloquence without sacrifice of precision.'[1]

From his works, it is found that Kālidāsa was a firm devotee of Śiva and a believer in the oneness of the gods of the Hindu Trinity.[2] His faith in the teachings of the *Upaniṣads* and the *Bhagavadgītā* is revealed in the prayers addressed to the three gods.[3] His love of leading a life quiet and undisturbed by the ills of humanity is evident in every work of his. He was certainly aware of the sufferings of the people.[4] He took an objective view of them. It is said that he does not offer 'any solution or suggested solution of the mysteries of life.' He was neither a moralist preaching to the people the good ways of living nor a social reformer to work for the people amidst them. His works suggest the means to get rid of them. The value of renunciation, the shortcomings of addiction to beastly passion, nobility of the divine aspect of love, and the duties of the rulers and others are broadly touched by him who betrays his minute study of life in all its phases.

---

[1] C. E. M. Joad : The History of Indian Civilisation. p. 97
[2] *Kumārasambhava* VI-44
[3] " II & VI
Raghuvaṁśa X
[4] " VIII, XIV
Kumārasambhava IV *Abhijñānaśākuntala* IV, V & VI

CHAPTER XXIII

POST-KALIDASAN DRAMATISTS

Śūdraka is a dramatist of great reputation next only to Kālidāsa. He appears to have been a historical personage. He was a Brahmin named Indrāṇīgupta. He came to be called Śūdraka, as he became a king leaving aside his duties of the Brahmin. He defeated Svāti the *Āndhrajātīya* prince and began to rule the kingdom in Ujjain. He reigned for one hundred years.[1] This account of Śūdraka differs a little from that contained in the prologue of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*.[2] The identity of Svāti whom Śūdraka is said to have defeated cannot be established, as there were at least four kings in the *Āndhrajātīya* dynasty with this name.[3] Since it is said that Śūdraka defeated Svāti and reinstated him on the throne, the dynasty to which Svāti belonged would not have come to an end by then. The reference may be to any one of the four kings. The incident of Āryaka overthrowing Pālaka, the then reigning king, as referred to in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka, does not offer any direct hint to identify and interpret the life-account of Śūdraka given in the *Avantisundarī*. From the *Padmaprābhṛtaka* of Śūdraka, it is found that the followers of Pāṇini's grammar were engaged in a bitter controversy with the followers of the *Kātantra* grammar.[4] This may point to a period in the Āndhrajātīya dynasty subsequent to Guṇāḍhya's leaving the court of Sātavāhana, king of Pratiṣṭhāna. Neither the *Mṛcchakaṭika* nor *Avantisundarī* and *Avantisundarīkāthasāra* refer to the city where he reigned but the scenes in all these works and *Padmaprābhṛtaka* are laid in Ujjain. Śūdraka might have been the ruler of Ujjain. On the strength of the evidences available, it can be said that Śūdraka could have ruled after Vikramāditya about the beginning of the Christian era when the *Sātavāhanas* were ruling at Pratiṣṭhāna or was a contemporary of Kālidāsa.

That Śūdraka could not have been the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭīka* because of a reference to his death made by himself in the prologue[5] cannot be maintained, as this could be interpreted as interpolated soon after his death. Śūdraka was a poet and also king.[6] Śūdraka is the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, a *Prakaraṇa*, *Padmaprābhṛtaka* a *Bhāṇa* and *Vīṇāvāsavadatta* a *Nāṭaka*.

---

[1] *Avantisundarī* of Daṇḍin : pp. 200-201; *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* IV 175-202

[2] *Mṛcchakaṭika* I 3-5

[3] *Avantisundarī* p. 184-185

[4] *Padmaprābhṛtaka* p. 8

[5] *Mṛcchakaṭika* I 4

[6] *Mṛcchakaṭika* I 3 Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti* 3-2-4; *Śūdraka's* life was described in the *Śūdrakakathā* of Rāmila and Somila, in a work of the same title by Pañcaśikha and in the anonymous work *Vikrāntaśūdraka*.

The *Mṛcchakaṭika* is in ten acts depicting the love of a poor young Brahmin Cārudatta and a courtesan Vasantasenā.[1] The love-plot is inter-woven with a political plot according to which the reigning king is deposed by a political prisoner. The incident of Vasantasenā filling up, with her jewels, the toy-cart made of mud belonging to Rohasena, her lover's son and the consequence of this leading to the execution of Cārudatta, though it failed, on the alleged charge of having murdered Vasantasenā for jewels justify the title *Mṛcchakaṭika* for the play. The sources of the play are not known. Perhaps the play is based on the contemporaneous events. The scenes describing gambling,[2] theft[3] and the policemen's search for the convict[4] who had escaped are very realistic. The author's intimate knowledge of music,[5] gambling, theft and astronomy[6] is found well presented. The scenes of sleep[7] and strangulation[8] are found presented on the stage. There are as many as thirty characters representing all walks of life from that of the learned judge to that of the executioners. This gives a cosmopolitan outlook for the play. Each character maintains individuality. Among them, *Śakāra* and *Vidūṣaka* deserve special mention here. The former is Saṁsthānaka but called as *Śakāra* on account of his mispronouncing the letters *ś*, *ṣ*, and *s* as *s*. His behaviour and talks are queer and provoke laughter.[9] The *Vidūṣaka* is more than a jovial companion of the hero. He is an ideal friend of Cārudatta, standing by him at all times. Love, humour and pathos are the sentiments in the play among which love has a dominating influence. There is a reference to a kind of quarrel called *Karṇāṭakakalaha.*[10] The language of the play is very simple and natural and lacks the charm of Kālidāsa. The author displays his skill in handling varieties of *Prākṛta* viz., *Śaurasenī*, *Āvantikā*, *Prācyā*, *Māgadhī* and three kinds of *Apabhraṁśa* viz., *Śākārī*, *Cāṇḍālī* and *Dhakkā*. Out of 377 stanzas contained in the play, 99 are in *Prākṛta*. The stage manager and Vasantasenā speak in *Prākṛta*, and *Saṁskṛta*. Effective characterisation, vigour, life, action, graphic descriptions[11] and the simple and clear diction give the play a realistic touch not to be met with in any other *Saṁskṛta* drama.

Śūdraka's *Padmaprābhṛtaka* is a *Bhāṇa* portraying the love of Devadattā and Mūladeva, the authority for the thieves. There is mention of a grammarian Dattakalaśi, son of Dandaśūka. He lived before Pāṇini. There is a reference to a drama named *Kumudvatī-prakaraṇa* and a *Prākṛta* poem Kāmadattā. One Dattaka is said to have used the *praṇava* at the beginning of his *sūtras* on the life of the courtesans. Bitter controversy raged between the grammarians following Pāṇini and the author of the *Kātantra* grammar.

---

[1] *Mṛcchakaṭika* I 6-7
[2] *Mṛcchakaṭika* II
[3] ,, IV
[4] ,, VI
[5] ,, III 4-5
[6] ,, VI 9-10
[7] ,, III.
[8] ,, VIII
[9] *Cf.* ,, I, 21, 25, 29
[10] ,, VI
[11] *Mṛcchakaṭika* IV describing Vasantasenā's abode and V describing the clouds. To the modern mind, the former would appear monotonous and unduly long.

The *Vīṇāvāsavadatta* is incomplete and breaks off in the third act. It describes how Udayana's imprisonment by Pradyota helped Vāsavadattā in learning from Udayana the art of playing on the viṇā. Śūdraka's authorship of this play may get support from the reference made by Vallabhadeva in the *Subhāṣitāvalī*,[1] and the reference in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* to the effort of Yaugandharāyaṇa in setting his master free.[2]

About the beginning of the Christian era, the *Bhāṇa Ubhayābhisārikā* by name was written by Vararuci depicting the love of Kuberadatta for two women. The scene is laid in Kusumapura. There is reference to the tenets of the *Vaiśeṣika* and *Sāṇkhya* systems. The elements of the art of dance are referred to. This play betrays the features of the Trivandrum plays ascribed to Bhāsa. The identity of the author is not known. To the same period belongs the *Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda* of Iśvaradatta. This is a *Bhāṇa* depicting the ways of the courtesans. It does not have the *Nāndī*. The scene is laid in Kusumapura. The quotation from Dattaka, an authority on love and the absence of reference to Vātsyāyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* help in assigning the play to the beginning of the Christian era.

The Buddhist Aśvaghoṣa is the author of the *Śārīputraprakaraṇa* also called as *Sāradvatīputraprakaraṇa* in nine acts dealing with the conversion of Maudgalyāyana and Śārīputra into *Buddhism*. The canons of dramaturgy are all strictly followed by the author. Of Aśvaghoṣa's authorship is another play which is available in fragments. The title is not known. A hetaera Magadhavatī by name is one of the characters. The scene is laid in a garden.

The authorship of a *Prahasana* named *Bhagavadajjuka* is attributed to Bodhāyana whose identity is not known. It is wrongly attributed to the authorship of Mahendravikraman, king of Kāñci, in whose inscription dated 610 A.D., it is mentioned. The names of the ten types of the drama given here differ from those commonly accepted. This may suggest for the play an early date about the first century A.D. The play is full of humour depicting the change of the bodies acquired under peculiar circumstances by an ascetic styled Bhagavān and a courtesan called Ajjukā. Of unknown authorship and of uncertain date is the *Prahasana* named *Dāmaka* depicting the role of Dāmaka, a friend of Karṇa who studied under Paraśurāma.

The *Kundamālā*, a play in six acts, dealing with the *Uttarakāṇḍa* story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is attributed to the authorship of Dinnāga. Dhīranāga is given as the name of the author in some manuscripts. The author need not be identified with the Buddhist logician Dinnāga, as the latter could not have written on a theme like this. The theme is the same as in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. The garland of the jasmine (*kunda*) strung by Sītā and left behind is identified by Rāma who begins to hope for reunion with Sītā. The *Nāndī* is in praise of Vināyaka and Śiva. Influence of Kālidāsa and Bhāsa is felt in this play. Bhavabhūti owed much to Dinnāga in writing the *Uttararāmacarita*.[1] One special feature of the play is the introduction of the *Vidūṣaka*, unlike the later plays based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The simple style would place this drama long before Bhavabhūti (700 A.D.) and *Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa* (C. 600 A.D.). The play can be assigned to the second or third century A.D.

---

[1] Subhāṣitavalī

[2] *Mṛcchakaṭika* IV 26

Viśākhadatta also known as Viśākhadeva was the son of Pṛthusūnu and grandson of Iśvaradatta. Apart from the title *Mahārāja* which Pṛthusūnu had, nothing is known about him. Viśākhadatta is the author of a play *Mudrārākṣasa* in seven acts depicting the attempt of Cāṇakya for compelling Rākṣasa, the hereditary minister of the *Nandas*, to become the minister of Candragupta Maurya. In this attempt, Cāṇakya succeeded by a series of devices employing the signet ring (*mudrā*) of Rākṣasa himself. Hence the title of the play. The rhetoricians and the authors of the anthologies quote certain passages attributing them to the authorship of Viśākhadatta making him the author of two more dramas named *Devīcandragupta* and *Abhisārikāvañcitaka* also called as *Abhisārikābanāhitaka* both of which are not available. The former is a love play concerning Candragupta and the latter is concerned with Udayana, Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī. The *Bharatavākya* in the *Mudrārākṣasa* has the words पार्थिवश्चन्द्रगुप्तः in the end. Candragupta mentioned here cannot be the *Maurya* king but one of the *Gupta* emperors. The contents of the *Devīcandragupta*, as gathered from the quotations, support this. Against this, stand the different readings of the *Bharatavākya* containing the words, *dantivarman*, *rantivarman* and *avantivarman*. Dantivarman may refer to the *Pallava* king (C. 800 A.D.), *Lāṭa* king (C. 850 A.D.) or *Rāṣṭrakūṭa* king (C. 900 A.D.) all having this name. There is no evidence to support Viśākhadatta's connection with any of these kings. The word *rantivarman* does not convey any sense. The reading *avantivarman* may suggest the author's connection with the court of the *Maukhari* king with this name, who was the father-in-law of Rājyaśrī, sister of Harṣavardhana of Kanauj. This would give 600 A.D., as the date of Viśākhadatta. Against this, stands an evidence in the form of a reference to the eclipse.[1] The nature of mercury' conjunction in the eclipse was held before Varāhamihira who died in 573 A.D., and who refuted it. Hence Viśākhadatta, who makes a reference to it, must have lived before 573 A.D. Besides, the drama contains the description of Pāṭaliputra as a prosperous and flourishing city.[3] During the visit of the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Thsang in the 7th century A.D., the city was in ruins while it was in a flourishing condition during the visit of Fa-hien about 400 A.D. All these prove that Viśākhadatta must have lived in the 4th century A.D., under the *Gupta* emperors.

---

[1] *Cf. Kundamālā* (M.R. Kavi's Edn)
P. 3 with *Uttararāmacarita* I 45
P. 30 „ p. 71 (N.S. Press, Bombay)
Act IV „ III
V 10 „ VI 12

[2] *Mudrārākṣasa* I 6

[3] *Mudrārākṣasa* III

Viśākhadatta is quite at home with the technicalities of astronomy[1] and logic.[2] The unsteady nature of royalty is described in a way[3] similar to that contained in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* while Śūkanāsa gives instructions to Candrāpīḍa. This is the one of very rare plays with a purely political theme. Subtle plot construction and the well-knit scenes give an individual stamp to the play. The style of the play is simple, full of vigour and force.

The *Kaumudīmahotsava* is a drama in five acts showing how king Kalyāṇavarman regained his lost kingdom of Magadha about 340 A.D. The play was staged when Kalyāṇavarman was installed on the throne of Magadha. It was written by a woman whose name is made out to be Vijjakā from the manuscript. Vijjakā otherwise known as Vijayā was the wife of Candrāditya (C. 650 A.D.) son of Pulakeśin II. The statement contained in the drama that it was staged on the occasion of Kalyāṇavarman's coronation shall not be given serious consideration, as the authoress lived agout 650 A.D. There is internal evidence to show that Vijayā must have written the play.[4] The play betrays the influence of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa.

The *Mattavilāsaprahasana* was written by the *Pallava* king Mahendravikraman I (600-630 A.D.) It is a farce depicting the degraded condition of life led by the adherents of *Buddhism*, and of Kāpālika and Pāśupata sects of *Saivism*. Karpaṭa is mentioned as the author of a manual for thieves. There is a hint to the story of the *Kiratārjunīya* of Bhāravi.[1]

Harṣavardhana, referred to as Harṣadeva, was the king of Sthāṇviśvara between 606 and 648 A.D. He was himself a man of letters and patronised Bāṇa, Mayūra, Mātaṅgadivākara and others. He is the author of a *Nāṭaka Nāgānanda* and two *Nāṭikās Ratnāvalī* and *Priyadarśikā*. Bāṇa's reference to his patron as a writer and Hieun Thsang's mentioning the *Nāgānanda* as Harṣa's work set aside their alleged authorship of Bāṇa or any other poet in the court of Harṣa.

The Nāgānanda in five acts depicts Jīmūtavāhana as a self-sacrificer. He lays down his life to save a snake Śaṁkhacūḍa from Garuḍa. He is restored to life through the grace of Gaurī. The *Ratnāvalī* in four acts deals with the love of Sāgarikā, the princess of Siṁhaladvīpa and Udayana of Kauśāmbī. The play is modelled upon the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. The vision conjured by the magician and the change of costume taken up by Sāgarikā to escape being detected by

---

[1] *Mudrārākṣasa* IV 19-21
[2] *Mudrarākṣasa* V 10
[3] „ III 5
[4] *Kaumudīmahotsava* IV 19
[5] *Mattavilāsaprahasana* 22

Vāsavadattā are invented by the author. Sāgarikā's identity got established by her gem-necklace (*ratnāvalī*) which gives the title to the play. The *Priyadarśikā* also deals with Udayana's love. Here Āraṇyikā is the beloved to enjoy the king's love. In the presence of the queen Vāsavadattā, her marriage with Udayana is enacted. Āraṇyikā plays the role of the queen and Udayana plays his own part undetected by the queen.

Harṣa is not clever in plot construction. He shapes what he borrows from others to suit his purposes. The characters are referred to as *Rājā*, *Nāyaka*, *Devi etc.* The syle of Harṣa is chaste and refined. Love is the sentiment dominant in all the three plays. Though *śānta* (quietitude) is given prominence in the *Nāgānanda*, it does not have the dominating position, being subordinated to love.

To Śyāmilaka is attributed the *Bhāṇa Pādatāḍitaka* showing how a Brahmin Viśṇunāga having received a kick on the head from the foot of a courtesan, consults a number of persons as to the means of expiation for this and is advised to receive another kick from the other foot of the same courtesan. The author was a northerner and son of Viśveśvaradatta. He might have been identical with a friend of Bāṇa Somila by name or his cousin Śyāmala whom Bāṇa mentions in the *Harṣacarita*.[1] Then he could have lived about 650 A.D. Some scholars identify him with Śyāmilaka, father of Mahimabhaṭṭa (1050 A.D.), the author of the *Vyaktiviveka*. In this case, Śyāmilaka must have lived about 1000 A.D. Bāṇa's influence is felt in the enumeration of persons who were of spotless conduct.[2] There are references to the names of some law-books,[3] a poet Pārāśava,[4] Āryaka a poet from the South,[5] Gupta and Maheśvara who became poets by following Vararuci's kāvya[6] and to certain kings.[7] It is not known whether there is some kind of connection between this work and the *Mukuṭatāḍitaka*, the lost work of Bāṇa.

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is the author of the *Veṇisaṁhāra* in six acts describing the events in the *Mahābhārata* war leading to the tying up of the braid of Draupadī by Bhīma. She untied it in the gambling hall swearing that she would not tie it until Duryodhana's death. Bhīma kills Duryodhana and ties her braid. Hence the title. This incident is the creation of the dramatist. Bhīma is glorified and contrasted from the weak Duryodhana whose sensuous love is depicted in Act II. Bhānumati, the wife of Duryodhana, who is introduced here, is a character created by the dramatist. Karṇa is shown in black colours and this is achieved by glorifying Aśvatthāman. The chief merit of this play is individuality of character. The main sentiment is heroism. Bhattanārāyaṇa's style belongs to the *Gauḍa* type. His language is forcible and vigorous. The play has many detached brilliant scenes. Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa was invited by king Ādiśūra of Bengal to perform a

---

1. *Harṣacarita* I & III
2. *Pādatāḍitaka* p. 7
3. *Pādatāḍitaka* p. 5
4. ,, p. 7
6. ,, p. 46
6. ,, p. 47
7. ,, p. 9 & 19

sacrifice to avert the evil effects of a famine. This king lived about 650 A.D. Vāmana (C. 800 A.D.) is the earliest rhetorician to quote him. Hence his date may be fixed about 650 A.D.

Śaktibhadra, a pupil of Śaṅkarācārya (632-664 A.D.), is the author of the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* in seven acts. His date shall be taken as C. 700 A.D. In the prologue, he tells he is the first dramatist in South India. This play betrays all the features of the Trivandrum plays. The title is derived from a miraculous crest-gem which was given to Rāma and Sītā by the hermits. Making use of it, Rāma and *Sītā* saved themselves from being deceived by the fictitious Rāma, Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa created by Rāvaṇa. The dominating element in the play is *Adbhutarasa*. The play shows Bhaṭṭanārāyana's influence.[1] From the prologue of the play, it is learnt that Śaktibhadra wrote another play called *Unmādavāsavadattā* which is now lost.

The *Rāmābhyudaya* in six acts depicting the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* was composed by Yaśovarman (C. 720 A.D.) the patron of Bhavabhūti, Vākpati and others. It is now lost and is known only from the quotations in the works on rhetorics.

Bhavabhūti, a protege of king Yaśovarman and elder contemporary of Vākpati, is the author of three dramas *Mahāvīracarita*, *Mālatīmādhava* and *Uttararāmacarita*. From the prologues of these plays, it is learnt that his name was Srīkantha and that he got the title Bhavabhūti out of devotion to Siva. He was a native of Padmapura in the Vidarbha country. He was the son of Nīlakaṇṭha and Jatukarṇī and grandson of Bhaṭṭagopāla. He was of *Kāśyapa* gotra and belonged to the *Taittirīya* branch of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. His kinsmen belonged to a family called *Udumbara* and performed *Soma* sacrifice. He was proficient in *Vyākaraṇa*, *Mīmāṁsā* and *Nyāya*. He was deeply learned in rhetoric, *Upaniṣads*, *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Vedānta* and ritualistic lore. His preceptor was one Jñānanidhi. He moved freely with the actors while he was young.

Vide :—भवभूतिर्नाम कविः निसर्गसौहृदेन भरतेषु वर्तमानः ।

Mālatīmādhava : Prastāvanā.

An attempt is made to identify Bhavabhūti with Uṁveka, a pupil of Kumārilabhaṭṭa (C. 650 A.D.) and author of a commentary on the latter's *Ślokavārtika*. This identification is sought to be supported by the colophon in the early manuscripts of the *Mālatīmādhava* containing a reference to the author as a pupil of Kumārilabhaṭṭa and by the opening verse in the commentary on the *Ślokavārtika* being identical with the śloka 8 Act I of the *Mālatīmādhava*. As against this identification, it is contended that if Bhavabhūti had been a pupil of Kumārilabhaṭṭa, he would have mentioned his preceptor's name in the prologue of the play *Mālatīmādhava* and would have made a specific mention of *Mīmāṁsā* in the śloka 10 Act I of the same drama. Thus this identification is yet to be proved beyond dispute.

---

[1] *Cf. Veṇīsaṁhāra* I 21 and *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇī* VI 21

The *Mahāvīracarita* in seven acts is the first play of Bhavabhūti. It deals with the life of Rāma from his marriage with Sītā till his coronation. Rāvaṇa sends an envoy to Janaka seeking the hand of Sītā but is disappointed by Rāma's marriage with Sītā. At the instigation of his minister Mālyavān, Śūrpaṇakhā appears in Mithilā in the guise of Mantharā, the servant of Kaikeyī, demanding Rāma's exile to the forest and Vālin attacks Rāma who steps into Kiṣkindhā. The wordy duel between Rāma and Paraśurāma is unduly long and mars the effect of the play. It is held that the drama, which Bhavabhuti wrote up to the *śloka* 46 Act IV, was continued by one Subrahmaṇya. No reason is however advanced to show what made Bhavabhūti stop abruptly in Act IV.

The *Mālatīmādhava* is a *Prakaraṇa* in ten acts depicting the course of love between Mādhava and Mālatī, respectively son and daughter of the ministers in two different countries but thick friends. Side by side is depicted the growth of love between Makaranda and Madayantikā, friends of Mādhava and Mālatī. There are many beautiful but detached scenes. Makaranda dresses himself in the garb of a woman and marries one Nandana who was promised the hand of Mālatī. He saves Madayantikā from the attack of a tiger which incident creates love in them. Mālatī was twice kidnapped by a Kāpālika woman to be offered to the deity but was saved by Mādhava on the first occasion and on the second by an associate of Kāmandakī a Buddhist nun who took interest in the welfare of Mālatī and Mādhava and helped in getting them married.

In the seven acts of the *Uttararāmacarita*, Bhavabhūti depicts the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. He was influenced by the *Kundamālā* of Dinnāga, Act VII of the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* and Veṇisaṁhāra.[1] The reunion of the lovers is effected by the introduction of a small scene (*antarnāṭikā*) of the epic story. This play is more a dramatic poem than a drama proper.

All the three plays were enacted on the occasion of a festival of Kālapriyanātha in Ujjain. Bhavabhūti does not show any skill in the treatment of the plot. Rāma is shown to faint twice. Mālatī is carried away twice by the Kāpālika woman. His descriptions are often long and tedious.[2] They reveal his inability to stop when enough has already been said. Some of the prose passages are unnecessarly long.[2] Long and involved compounds occur too often. Some of the expressions are harsh and unfamiliar. These shortcomings are outweighed by the merits of the plays. The tone of the plays is elevated. It is difficult to come across a play where the conflict of feelings in higher walks of life is depicted so impressively and deftly. Bhavabhūti is unrivalled in depicting the tender feelings of life such as friendship.[1] He is a true lover of Nature appreciating both the mild and fearful aspects.[2] His language, though lacking the polish of Kālidāsa, becomes forcible and simpler whenever something that is soul-stirring is to be conveyed.[3] Such passages have a charm and elegance not met with in any other *Saṁskṛta* drama.

---

[1] *Cf.* Mālatimādhava IX 40 and Veṇisaṁhāra VI 31

[2] *Cf.* *Uttararāmacarita* III

[3] *Cf.* *Mālatīmādhava* III & V

A study of the three plays reveals Bhavabhūti as one who was content with what he had. He was not a believer in putting up unequal fights in the world for getting material ends. He was an ideal *gṛhastha*. Love was not a mere sensuous affair but a spiritual communion of souls.[4] It is perfected through children.[5] Hence he did not choose the harem atmosphere, or polygamous characters. He did not allow himself to be bound by conventions followed by the dramatists. There is therefore no reference to the cuckoo, mango blossom, *aśoka* and *bakula* trees. He makes Mādhava sell human flesh and describes cemetery.

It is the serious study which Bhavabhūti undertook for depicting life that has made the love of Rāma and Sītā, and of Mālatī and Mādhava appeal more directly with a realistic touch than that of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. Therefore his plays have no humour and consequently no *Vidūṣaka*. Self-effacement and self sacrifice characterised his outlook on life[6] and therefore that of his characters as well.

Heroism dominates the *Māhāvīracarita*, love the *Mālatīmādhava* and pathos the *Uttararāmacarita*. The second mentioned is the only play where all other sentiments have their due place. Bhavabhūti was the earliest dramatist to give prominence to the *karuṇa rasa* in a drama. It is even said that he has excelled not only others but his own self in this play.

Vide :—1. कारुण्यं भवभूतिरेव तनुते ।
2. उत्तरे रामचरिते भवभूतिर्विशिष्यते ॥

Bhavabhūti seems to suggest a synthesis of the sentiments culminating in *karuṇa*.[7]

Bhavabhūti betrays his knowledge of *Advaita Vedānta*,[8] *Upaniṣads* and Vedic rituals. He quotes some authorities on *dharma* and *kāma*. His play *Mālatīmādhava* refers to Śaṅkarapura, Suvarṇabindu a place of Śiva, to the rivers Varadā, Sindhu, Lavaṇā, Godāvarī, Madhumatī, and Pāṭalāvatī. The Pāśupatas, their centre Śrīparvata in the Kurnool district of the Andhra state, Kāpālikas and their practices[9] are repeatedly mentioned.

---

[1] *Uttararāmacarita* II 19, VI 12. [2] *Uttararāmacarita* II
[3] ,, II 27 & VI 11
Mālatīmādhava I 30-34; V 10
[4] *Uttararāmacarita* I 39. *Mālatīmādhava* VI 18
[5] ,, III 17
[6] *Mālatīmādhava* VIII 14 [7] *Uttararāmacarita* III 47
[8] *Uttararāmacarita* VI 6 [9] *Mālatīmādhava*. V 1-4

In point of greatness and popularity, Bhavabhūti comes next to Kālidāsa. The latter reveals through his works the power to suggest sentiments and ideas and readiness to abide by dramatic conventions. The former is a master of expression revealing his ability to adopt different ways of writing according to the occasions and violated the dramatic conventions thereby choosing a larger field to display his talents. While Kālidāsa frequently resorts to the figures of speech for presenting a graphic description of the situations, Bhavabhūti selects the typical aspects of the situation.[1] Kālidāsa's influence is found in the message which Mādhava sends to his beloved through a cloud,[2] although he was a master of *Śikhariṇī*[3].

Bhavabhūti was a शब्दब्रह्मवित्[4]. He claims his supreme mastery over the language.[5] That he is justified in this claim is evident from the appreciation of Dhanapāla, the author of the *Tilakamañjari*.

स्पष्टभावरसा चित्रैः पदन्यासैः प्रवर्तिता ।
नाटकेषु नटस्त्रीव भारती भवभूतिना ।।

Anaṅgaharṣamātrārāja is the author of the *Tāpasavatsarāja* in six acts. On hearing the death of Vāsavadattā in the forest conflagration, Udayana turns into a sage; yet he is not able to control his grief at the loss of his wife. When he was about to throw himself into a river, he meets there Vāsavadattā who too had come there for the same purpose. The lovers get reunited, giving up their resolves. The author is referred to by Dāmodaragupta[6] (C.770 A.D.) the author of the *Kuṭṭinīmata* and Murāri,[7] the author of the *Anargharāghava*. The date of this dramatist shall be placed about 700 A.D. The *Udāttarāghava* on the *Rāmāyaṇa* theme was written by Māyurāja. The admission of the identity of Māyurāja with Anaṅgaharṣa, as suggested by some scholars, would place this writer about 700 A.D. Otherwise, he could have lived before 900 A.D. the date of Rājaśekhara who refers to him. The drama however is available only in citations of the rhetoricians. Towards the end of the eighth century, Kulaśekharavarman, a king of Kerala, wrote two plays *Subhadrādhanañjaya* and *Tapatīsaṁvaraṇa* on the epic themes.

Murāri was the son of Bhaṭṭa Śrīvardhamāna of Maudgalyagotra. He refers to Anaṅgaharṣa, (C.700 A.D.), the author of the *Tāpasavatsarāja* and is cited by Ratnākara (C. 850), the author of the *Haravijaya*.[8] Hence he could have lived about 750 A.D. Closely following the *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti, he wrote the Anargharāghava in seven acts. While describing the return journey of Rāma from Laṅka, the author describes the land as seen from the air, betraying his poor geographical knowledge. The literary embellishments and the chaste language have won for him unique admiration at the hands of the later day rhetoricians and grammarians. He is praised as a master of *Vakrokti* by Maṅkha.[1] There is a reference to *Kaṭandī* which is said to be a commentary on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* by Rāvaṇa. The identity of this work is not known. Murāri was influenced by Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa[2] and Bhavabhūti.[3] In all probability, he wrote the drama to vie with Bhavabhūti. This is indicated by the following statements current among the scholars who admired his command over language as they did Māgha.

---

[1] *Uttararāmacarita* III 36
[2] *Mālatīmādhava* IX 25, 26
[3] *Suvṛttatilaka* III 33
[4] *Uttararāmacarita* VII 21
[5] *Uttararāmcarita* I 2
[6] *Kuṭṭinīmata* 800
[7] *Anargharāghava* VII 113
[8] *Haravijaya* XXXVIII 68

भवभूतिमनादृत्य निर्वाणमतिना मया ।
मुरारिपदचिन्तायामिदमाघीयते मनः ।।
मुरारिपदचिन्तायां भवभूतेस्तु का कथा ।
भवभूतिं परित्यज्य मुरारिमुररीकुरु ।।
मुरारिपदचिन्ता चेत् तदा माघे मतिं (रतिं) कुरु ।
मुरारिपदचिन्ता चेत् तदा माघे मतिं कुरु ।।

About the same period must have lived Bhīmaṭa, the author of a number of dramas, all of them being lost to us. Among them, the well-known plays are the *Svapnadaśānana*, *Pratibhācāṇakya* and *Manoramāvatsarāja*. Since these are cited by Rājaśekhara (C. 900 A.D.), Bhīmaṭa could have lived about 800 A.D.

Rājaśekhara, a member of the *Yāyāvarīya* princely family, flourished in the first half of the tenth century, as he himself states that he was the teacher of Nirbhaya (C. 900 A.D.), the *Pratīhāra* king. He married Avantisundarī an accomplished lady of the *Cahamāna* family. He is the author of six dramas of which four are available, viz., *Karpūramañjarī*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Viddhasālabhañjikā* and *Bālabhārata*. The fifth play *Haravilāsa* is lost and the name of the last one is not known. The *Karpūramañjarī* is a *Saṭṭaka* describing the love of Prince Caṇḍapāla and Princess Karpūramañjarī. The incidents of *dohada*, imprisonment of the princess and others betray the influence of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Ratnāvalī*. The *Bālarāmāyaṇa* is in ten acts and is called *Mahānāṭaka*. The prologue is of the size of an act and each act is of that of a *Nāṭikā*. Sītā's marriage is enacted in Laṅkā. Rāvaṇa falls in love with a wooden image of Sītā and out of disappointment runs mad like Purūravas in the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The last act depicting the return journey of Rāma shows the author's poor geographical knowledge. The *Viddhasālabhañjikā* is a *Nāṭikā* depicting the love of Vidyādharamalla for two princesses Mṛgāṅkāvalī and Kuvalyayamālā. It betrays the influence of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Ratnāvalī*. The *Bālabhārata* is in two acts dealing with the story of the Pāṇḍavas up to the gambling match. Though poor in the creation of a plot, Rājaśekhara is clever in commanding a graceful style. He uses some of the expressions current then in the *Gujarāti* and other languages.

---

[1] *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* XXV

[2] *Cf. Anargharāghava* IV 46 with *Veṇīsaṁhāra* I 12
Cf. „ IV 25 „ III 23

[3] *Cf.* „ I 59 with *Uttararāmacarita* VI 12
„ II 9 „ II 4
„ II 58 „ I 10
„ IV 29 *Mahāvīracarita* II 36

About the same period, Kṣemīśvara, a contemporary of Rājaśekhara, wrote the *Naiṣadhānanda* in seven acts and the *Caṇḍakauśika* in five acts. The latter was written for king Mahīpāla of Kanauj (C.910 A.D.), who patronised him and Rājaśekhara.

Lost in their originals but known from quotations are the four plays *Taraṅgadatta*, *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, *Pāṇḍavānanda* and *Chalitarāma*, all of them of unknown authorsuip. They must have been composed before 1000 A.D., when Dhanika quoted from them in his *Daśarūpāvaloka*. The first two are known to be *Prakaraṇas* having respectively a courtesan and a woman of noble birth as the heroines. The other two are respectively based on the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. A similar fate had overtaken the plays of Kṣemendra (1050 A.D.). The *Citrabhārata* and *Kanakajānakī* appear to have been prominent among them.

To the authorship of Bilhaṇa, is attributed the *Nāṭikā Karṇasundarī* dealing with the marriage of Kāmadeva Trailokyamalla of Anhilvad in his advanced age with Princess Miyāṇalladevī of Karṇāṭa. To this period belongs the *Hanumannāṭaka* also called as *Mahānāṭaka* in fourteen acts depicting the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is said that Hanumān composed this but cast it into the sea on hearing that Vālmīkī was writing the story of Rāma. At the instance of Bhoja of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.) the play, which was recorded in the rocks, was recast into the form of a work. This would give the middle of the 11th century as the date of this play. This is available in two recensions one prepared by Madhusūdana in nine acts and another by Dāmodaramiśra in fourteen acts. It contains no *Nāndī* or *Prastāvanā* or any *Prākṛta* passage. There is little prose in it. It contains some of the lines from the works of Kālidāsa.[1] To the same period belong the farce *Laṭakamelaka* of Śaṅkhadhara kavirāja and the *Vyāyoga* called *Dhanañjayavijaya* of Kāñcanapaṇḍita on Arjuna's victory in the incident of cattle-lifting.

Rāmacandra, the one-eyed pupil of Hemacandra (1088-1172) the Jain writer, was the author of about a hundred works. The most popular among them are the seven-act *Nāṭaka Nalavilāsa, the Vyāyoga Nirbhayabhīma*, the six-act *Nāṭaka Satyahariścandra* and the *Prakaraṇa Kaumudīmitrānanda*. The fight between Arjuna and Śiva was dramatised in 1153 A.D. by Vigraharājadeva Viśāladeva of the *Cahamāna* family. The play, which is called *Harakelināṭaka*, is partially preserved in stone at Ajmere. Somadeva, who was patronised by Vigraharājadeva, composed the *Lalitavigrahanāṭaka* on the love of his patron for Deśaladevī. This is also partially preserved on stone in Ajmere.

---

[1] *Cf.* I 30, IV 3, X 9

Vatsarāja, the minister of Paramardideva of Kālañjara (1168-1203 A.D.), is the author of six plays, each representing one rare type of the dramas. They are the *Kirātārjunīya* a *Vyāyoga*, *Karpūracarita* a *Bhāṇa*, *Hāsyacūḍāmaṇi* a *Prahasana*, *Rukmiṇīharaṇa* an *Ihāmṛga*, *Tripuradāha* a *Dima* and *Samudramathana* a *Samavākāra*.

In the 13th century was written the *Prasannarāghava* by Jayadeva, the son of Mahādevī and Sumitrā. He was a logician, rhetorician and dramatist. His elegant verses won him the title *Pīyūṣavarṣa*. The *Prasannarāghava* is in seven acts on the model of Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita*. The demon Bāṇa is made, in addition to Rāvaṇa, a rival suitor for the hand of Sītā. It abounds in elegant, lyrical and undramatic verses. The *Paramāra* king Arjunavarman patronised his master Madana, who held the title *Bālasarasvatī* and wrote in 1213 A.D., the *Nāṭikā Pārijātamañjarī* also called *Vijayaśrī*. This play depicts the change of a celestial garland into a maiden when it fell on the chest of Arjunavarman and her marriage with him. Two acts of this play are preserved on stone at Dhārā. The *Hammīramadamardana* of the *Śvetāmbara* Jain contains five acts describing the defeat inflicted by Vīradhavala on the Mohammedans who invaded Gujarat. The play is dated as 1230 A.D.

Arjuna's victory over the Kauravas who lifted the cattle in the land of Virāṭa was described in the *Vyāyoga Pārthaparākrama* by Prahlādana, (1300 A.D.), brother of the *Paramāra* king Dhārādhavala. About this period was described the prowess of Bhīma by Mokṣāditya in the *Vyāyoga Bhīmaparākrama*. About the daring deeds of the robber Rauhiṇeya was written the drama *Prabuddharauhiṇeya* in six acts by Rāmabhadramuni, a *Jain* monk and pupil of Jayaprabhasūri. This play belongs to the beginning of the 14th century A.D. when in Kerala, Prince Ravivarman wrote the *Pradyumnābhyudaya* in five acts on the destruction of Vajranābha, king of Vajrapura and on the marriage of Prince Pradyumna with the princess Prabhāvatī. Vidyānātha's (1300 A.D.) *Pratāparudrīyakalyāṇa* in five acts deals with the accession to the throne of king Pratāparudra of Warangal (1294-1325 A.D.) This is included within the author's *Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūṣaṇa*, a work on rhetorics.

About the middle of the 14th century, Narasiṁha, the nephew of Agastya who is also known as Vidyānātha, perhaps the author of the *Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūṣaṇa*, dramatised Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* in the *Kādambarīkalyāṇa* containing eight acts. His brother Viśvanātha, who was the preceptor of Gaṅgādevī, the authoress of the *Mathurāvijaya*, composed the *Vyāyoga Saugandhikāharaṇa* on Bhima's bringing the Saugandhika flower from Kubera's garden. To Viśveśara, patronised by Siṅgabhūplala (C.1360), is attributed the authorship of two plays *Kandarpasambhava* and *Vīrabhadravijṛmbhaṇa*, the latter being of the *Dima* type. The farce *Dhūrtasamāgama* is attributed to the pen of Jyotirīśvara who held the title *Kaviśekhara* and who belonged to the same period. In imitation of Act IV of the

Vikramorvaśīya was written the *Unmattarāghava*, the one-act Aṅka by Bhāskara whose identity is not known. The reference to Vidyāraṇya in the play, if interpreted in favour of his identity with Vidyāraṇya of Vijayanagar, would suggest 1350 as the date of the play. Another play with the same title was written by Virūpākṣa, son of Harihara II of the Vijayanagar dynasty. The play which belongs to the *Prekṣaṇaka* type shows the death of Rāvaṇa at the hands of Lakṣmaṇa. In the meanwhile, Rāma searches for Sītā in a maddened mood which is got rid off by his reunion with Sītā. Another drama *Nārāyaṇavilāsa* is also attributed to the same king who lived in the latter half of the 14th century. About the same period, the *Nepalese* poet Maṇika depicted, in the *Bhairavānanda*, the love of Bhairava for a celestial woman Madanavatī.

In complete imitation of Bhavabhūti's Mālatīmādhava, was written the *Prakaraṇa Mallikāmāruta* by Uddaṇḍa (C. 1400 A.D.), the author of the *Kokilasandeśa*. To the same period belong the Bhāṇa called *Mukundānanda* of Kāśīpati Kavirāja and also the *Pārvatīpariṇaya* a *Nāṭaka* in five acts, *Kanakalekhākalyāṇa* a *Nāṭikā* and *Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabhāṇa* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa. The fight, which took place about 1450 A.D., between Camparir prince and a Shah of Gujarat, is dealt with in the *Gaṅgādāsapratāpavilāsa* by Gaṅgādhara. About the same period, Harihara dealt with Bhartṛhari's renunciation in the *Bhartṛharinirveda* containing five acts. In praise of Kṛṣṇa were written the *Nāṭaka Vidagdhamādhava* in ten acts, the *Nāṭaka Lalitamādhava* in ten acts and the *Bhāṇa Dānakelikaumudī* by Rūpagosvāmin (C. 1500 A.D.), the pupil of Śrī Kṛṣṇacaitanya. About the same period was written the *Nāṭaka Muditamadālasā* in seven acts by Gokulanātha.

The death of Kaṁsa at the hands of Kṛṣṇa was depicted by Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa (C.1600 A.D.) in the *Kaṁsavadha* containing seven acts. To the same period belongs the *Bhaimīpariṇaya* of Ratnakheṭa Śrīnivāsadīkṣita, a contemporary of Appayadīkṣita. The life-account of king Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore (1614-1632 A.D.) was portrayed in the *Raghunāthavilāsa* of Yajñanārāyaṇadīkṣita, son of Govindadīkṣita. The date of the play can be taken to be about 1620 A.D. At about the same time, Jagajjyotirmalla, a tributary prince of Nepal, wrote the *Haragaurīvivāha* which can be styled an opera. A play with the name *Bhojarājasaccarita* in two acts was composed by Vedānta Vāgīśabhaṭṭācārya, a poet in the court of Bhoja, son of Surjana a contemporary of the Moghul emperor Akbar (C. 1600 A.D.). The play glorifies Bhoja and his preceptor Cakradhara and mentions the sacred places in India. During the same period, Gururāma wrote the *Bhāṇa Madanagopālavilāsa*, the *Nāṭakas Subhadrādhanañjaya* in five acts and *Ratneśvaraprasādana* in five acts. The *Ānandarāghava* and *Kamalinīkalahaṁsa*, two *Nāṭakas* and *Śṛṅgārasarvasvabhāṇa* of Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita belong to this period.

On the life of Nala, Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita (1650 A.D.), the author of the *Śivalīlārṇava*, wrote the *Nalacarita* in six acts which appears to be incomplete. About the same period, Veṅkaṭādhvarin, the author of the *Viśvaguṇādarśa*, wrote the *Pradyumnānanda* in six acts on the marriage of Pradyumna with Rati. The *Saṭṭaka* named *Candralekhā* of Rudradāsa of the same period deals with the marriage of Candralekhā and Mānavedarāja. Mahādeva's (1650 A.D.) *Adbhutadarpaṇa* is in ten acts depicting the happenings in Laṅkā as though shown with the aid of a magic mirror. Rāmabhadradīkṣita (1700 A.D.) is the author of the *Jānakīpariṇaya* depicting Vidyujjihva, a demon in Laṅkā, Rāvaṇa, Sāraṇa a demon and Tāṭakā as Viśvāmitra, Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā respectively. They present themselves before Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and *Sītā* to deceive them. Śūrpaṇakhā appears before Bharata in the guise of an ascetic woman and spreads the false news of Rāma's death. The mischief is found out by the arrival of Rāma in Ayodhyā where the coronation takes place. The *Śṛṅgāratilaka* also called *Ayyābhāṇa* is attributed to the authorship of Rāmabhadradīkṣita. To the same period belong the *Subhadrāpariṇaya* and *Śṛṅgārasarvasva* a *Bhāṇa* of Nallākavi, the *Kautukaratnākara* a *Prahasana* by Kavitārkika and the *Dhūrtanartaka* a *Prahasana* and the *Śrīdāmacarita* in five acts by Sāmarājadīkṣita.

In the beginning of the 18th century, the *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya*, *Navamālikā a Nāṭikā* and *Śṛṅgāramañjarī* a *Saṭṭaka* were written by Viśveśvara. Rāmapāṇivāda (C. 1760 A.D.) is the author of the *Candrikāvīthī*, *Līlāvatī* a *Vīthī*, a farce named *Madanaketucarita* and a drama called *Sītārāghava*. During the same period, Devarāja glorified the victorious career of his patron Mārtāṇḍavarman, king of Trvanacore in the *Bālamārtāṇḍavijaya* a drama in five acts. Varadācārya's *Vasantatilakabhāṇa* also called *Ammābhāṇa* belongs to this period. During the same period, Ghanaśyāma, the minister of Tukoji, the Maharatta king of Tanjore, wrote more than one hundred works in *Saṁskṛta* and *Prākṛta*. Some among them are in the form of commentaries on the works of ancient poets. The well-known among those works are the *Madanasañjīvana* a *Bhāṇa*, *Navagrahacarita* and *Ānandasundarī*, the *Saṭṭakas* and *Damaruka* a *Prahasana*. Sundarī and Kamalā, his accomplished wives, commented on Rājaśekhara's *Viddhasālabhañjikā*. The *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya* and *Śṛṅgārasudhākara* are the two among other plays of Rāmavarman (C. 1770 A.D.) of Travancore. To the same period belongs Viśvanātha's *Mṛgāṅkalekhanāṭikā* in imitation of Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī*. The *Dima Manmathonmathana* is attributed to the authorship of Rāma (C. 1820 A.D.). A prince of Koṭiliṅgapura (modern Cranganore) wrote, about 1850 A.D., some plays, the well-known among them being the *Rasasadanabhāṇa*. About the same period was written the social play *Snuṣāvijaya* by Sundararājakavi.

Among the prominent plays of unsettled date, the following deserve mention. The *Nāṭikā Vṛṣabhānujā* by Mathurādāsa, the *Prahasana Hāsyārṇava* of Jagadīśa, the *Prahasana Kautukasarvasva* of Gopīnāthacakravartin, the *Kalyāṇasaugandhika* of Nīlakaṇṭha, the *Nāṭikā Śivanārāyaṇabhañjamahodaya*, philosophical in import, of Narasiṁha, the *Prekṣaṇaka Kṛṣṇābhyudaya* of Lokanāthabhaṭṭa, the *Ihāmṛga Sarvavinodanāṭaka* of Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Ghaṭikāśatakavi, the *Ihāmṛga Vīravijaya* of *Kṛṣṇamiśra*, the *Bhāṇa Śāradātilaka* of Śaṅkara, the *Gopālakelikrīḍā* of the irregular type by Rāmakṛṣṇa, and the *Śrīgadita Subhadrāharaṇa* of Mādhava.

ALLEGORIGAL PLAYS

From the earliest period of the development of the *Saṁskṛta* literature there has been growing a tendency on the part of the poets and scholars to personify inanimate objects and personal qualities. The growth and development of the various systems of thought and the need for preaching the moral standards gave strength and support to this kind of personification. The abstract qualities, so personified, came to play the role of characters in the dramas. The basis for writing the plays of this kind has been to show that anything when represented on the stage becomes perfected and attractive.

Vide :—न तच्छास्त्रं न सा विद्या न तच्छिल्पं न ताः कलाः ।
नासौ योगो न तद्ज्ञानं नाटके यन्न दश्यते ।।

Hence we come across, in these plays, characters like *Viveka* (discrimination), *Moha* (confusion), *Kāma* (cupid), *Dambha* (falsity), *Ahaṅkāra* (egoism), *Śraddhā* (faith) and others.

To Aśvaghoṣa's authorship is attributed an allegorical play available in fragments without the title. The *Āgamaḍambara* also known as *Saṇmatanāṭaka* is attributed to the authorship of the logician Jayantabhaṭṭa (C. 880 A.D.) The characters in the play are the well-known scholars in each system of thought such as Jayanta, Viśvarūpa, Dharmottara, Mañjīra and others. The play is not available in print.[1] Kṛṣṇamiśra is the author of the *Prabodhacandrodaya* in six acts which was written under one Gopāla who was the friend of king Kīrtivarman. There is an inscription of this king and is dated 1098 A.D. The date of the play may be fixed in the latter half of the 11th century A.D. There is a war between *Viveka* and *Mahāmoha*. It is put to an end by the rise of the moon in the form of knowledge (*prabodha*). The play is written in support of the *Advaita* system of thought. It lays stress on devotion to Viṣṇu which is the means to get salvation. The dialogues in which the Jains, Buddhists and Kāpālikas take part are highly interesting. The sentiment of *Śānta* dominates in the play. The author betrays his acquaintance with the places in Bengal.[2] The *Mohaparājaya* in five acts was written between 1229-32 A.D., by the Jain Yaśaḥpāla glorifying the conversion of Kumārapāla of

---

1. More information is contained in the article 'Bhaṭṭa Jayanta and Yaśovarman of Kashmir' by Rāma Kṛṣṇa Kavi in D.R. Bhandarkar volume.

2. *Prabodhacandrodaya-Prastāvanā*

Aṇhilvād into the Jain faith. In support of *Viśiṣṭādvaita* was written the *Saṅkalpasūryodaya* in ten acts by Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.). Salvation and freedom from the ills of life are to be got by the rise of the sun in the form of God's will. Śānta is the main sentiment of the play.[1] The lives of the fraudulent and the haughty are vividly exposed. Gokulanātha, son of a scholar Pītāmbara, is the author of the *Amṛtodaya* in five acts. It is written in defence of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems of thought. The *Bhāvanāpuruṣottama* of Ratnakheṭa Śrīnivāsadīkṣita and the *Caitanyacandrodaya* of Kavikarṇapūra belong to the end of the sixteenth century. About the beginning of the eighteenth century, Ānandarāyamakhin celebrated the glory of Śiva and Advaita in the *Vidyāpariṇaya* and presented the clever combination of the *Advaita Vedānta* and the fundamentals of the *Āyurvedic* science in the *Jīvānandanam*, a play in seven acts. It is held that a scholar Vedakavi wrote them and attributed them to the authorship of Ānandarāyamakhin, minister of Shahaji (1684-1710 A.D.), king of Tanjore. The *Dharmavijayanāṭaka* in five acts was written in 1737 A.D. by Bhūdevaśukla bringing out vividly the religious practises of this period.[2]

CHAYANAṬAKA

The shadow-play is of recent origin and finds no mention in the early dramatic treatises. Images made of cardboards are placed on the screen and are made to move by means of threads, the dialogues being repeated by persons behind the curtain. This represents the initial stage in the development of modern talkies. The later origin of this type of play is revealed by the absence of works belonging to this type in the early period. There are available veiled references to this type of play in the *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinava gupta (C.1000 A.D.)

The *Dharmābhyudaya* of Meghaprabhācārya is mentioned as *Chāyānāṭaka* in its prologue. The date of the work is not known. The *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhaṭa, which deals with Aṅgada's mission to Rāvaṇa, was shown on the stage in 1243 A.D. The author could have lived about 1200 A.D. Vyāsa Śrīrāmadeva, who lived in the first half of the 15th century A.D., produced three plays of this type under the names *Subhadrāpariṇaya*, *Rāmābhyudaya* and *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*. The later plays under this head are of insignificant value.

DECLINE OF THE DRAMA

The decadence of the Saṁskṛta drama, which began towards the end of the last century, may be accounted for as due to several causes. The influence of the epics and *Purāṇas* was such that the rising dramatists could not have a theme of their own invention. This resulted in the writing of too many dramas bearing the same title and based on the same theme. The works of this kind written in the later periods were ignored and became unpopular, unable to keep pace with the earlier plays. The rules of dramaturgy became more and more rigid with the production of more and more plays. The dramas which came to be written in the later period respecting these rules became stereotyped in form and so ceased to have attraction. The language, which became marked by involved constructions and far-fetched expressions, was felt very difficult to be understood. The drama, which is intimately connected with the Hindu religion both in outlook and purpose, began to lose its importance in the literary and secular spheres of Hindu life, when the Muslim conquerors established their hold in India and began to propagate and maintain their culture even among the people whom they ruled. In spite of these setbacks, the dramas continued to be written till the establishment of the British rule when encouragement for the writers ceased due to the weakening of the Indian states and when the members of the cultured classes gave up their traditional pursuits in order to train themselves in large numbers to serve the country under the guidance of an alien race professing a cultural outlook different from their own.

---

[1] *Saṅkalpasūryodaya* I 19

[2] A list of the allegorical plays is contained in the the Journal of Oriental Research Madras Vol. X, Part II.

CHAPTER XXIV

HISTORY

It is surprising to find that while every branch of study is represented in *Saṁskṛta*, history as a separate subject is not found to have been treated. The critics of the West explain this as due to the Indian psychological opposition to writing history. The Indian mind believes in the workings of fate, doctrine of *Karma*, intervention of superhuman elements in the daily life of the peoples and impermanence of the world. This prevents the mind from appreciating or taking note of contemporary occurrences. Man, however great he may be, is not independent and his actions are to be interpreted as the results of his past deeds. Even if such events are recorded, they are not going to last for all times. The heroes of the past, Rāma, Arjuna, Bhīma and Karṇa appeared to be great and real even though separated by a long period. Hence actions are recorded and the works glorifying them commented and expounded. The very few attempts made to record contemporary events have not served the purpose, as the worth of these records is vitiated by the faith of their authors in the superstitions and beliefs of their times.

This explanation is unconvincing, since the Indians did not understand history as the Western scholars do. The so-called beliefs and faiths referred to in this connection are deeprooted in the Indian mind by age-long experiences. Yet, there has been an attempt to record the events of historical importance. The results could not be treated as defective on account of the superstitions of the authors, for what is superstitious and what is not is to be examined and proved.

History was written in a manner peculiar to India. It takes the form of a literary piece with all the special features of the particular types marking it. The authors of such pieces were all poets in royal houses and so had to sing the praise of their patrons. Even when the latter get defeated, an indirect reference alone was made to the reverses of the kings. Therefore the details given by them may be slightly exaggerated but could not be treated as baseless. In this respect, they bear comparision to the reports of the exaggerated figures of losses sustained by one side given in modern times by the other side both engaged in war. The one difficulty presented by these records is the absence of uniform chronology and the availability of a number of eras.

The word 'history' may be rendered as '*vṛtta*' or '*carita*' which refers to the reality of the occurrence conveyed through them. In this sense, the epics and *Purāṇas* are works on history. The literary compositions, inscriptions, royal edicts and grants are of historical value. The genealogical accounts of the royal dynasties as given in the *Purāṇas* have been admitted by the Western scholars and their validity accepted only to the list of succession of kings. The periods of the rule of the dynasties as also of the members there have been treated as fantastically exaggerated. An attempt has not been so far made to study them without predilection and bias.[1]

Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Kunteśvaradautya* could be be cited as the earliest works quasi-historical in nature. Only inscriptions and not any standard work are available till the seventh century A.D. Mahendravikraman's *Mattavilāsaprahasana* helps us in knowing the conditions of some religious schools in Kāñcī. Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* represents the earliest attempt at writing history. Perhaps autobiography and biography started with Bāṇa. Besides containing a list of the writers who preceded Bāṇa, the work gives the correct portrayal of the society in the days of Bāṇa. The faiths and beliefs of people are well recorded. At the end of *Ucchvāsa VI*, Skandagupta relates to Harṣa the treacherous acts committed by a number of kings in order to take possession of a kingdom. The way in which they are narrated gives a realistic picture to the narration. The kings mentioned here are not mere names. Some of them are found mentioned in the *Purāṇas* and by Daṇḍin in the *Avantisundarī*.[2] Bāṇa might have had access to some chronicles which are now lost. Bāṇa refers to the practises of the followers of various religions. The reference[3] here to the *Bhāgavatas*, *Aupaniṣadas*, *Sāptatantavas*, *Śābdas* and *Pāñcarātrikas* is of great value in the history of religions. In two respects, Bāṇa does not give us the necessary information needed. Firstly, he does not make clear the position and actions of the Mālava and Gaūḍa princes who slew Grahavarman and Rajyavardhana respectively. Secondly, Bāṇa is silent over his contemporary poets in the court of Harṣavardhana. The *Kaumudīmahotsava* of Vījjakā throws light on the political intrigues in the royal house of the *Guptas*. Vākapati's *Gauḍavaho* has the title only by courtesy. The work stops with Vākpati's singing the glory of Yaśovarman's victorious march.

The poem *Bhuvanābhyudaya* was written by Śaṅkuka to describe the battle which took place in 850 A.D. between Utpala and Mamma. The poem is not available at present. The life of king Yaśodhara is recorded in Kanakasenavādirāja's *Yaśodharacarita*. The *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* of Padmagupta deals with the life of Sindhurāja of Dhārā and does not help us much in knowing the value of historical incidents. Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* is of high importance for history. King Āhavamalla was directed by Śiva, who appeared thrice in his dream, to instal his second son Vikramāditya on the throne. This prince had to fight constanlty with his elder brother Someśvara and younger brother Jayasiṁha. He took expeditions against the *Colas*. The last canto is autobiographical in content. Bilhaṇa's reference to the defeat of the *Rāṣṭrakūṭas* at the hands of the *Cālukyas*[1] is corroborated by contemporary evidences. The historians are of opinion that in this poem, facts had been distorted or suppressed.

---

[1] This is discussed in "The Plot in Indian Chronology" by Pandit Kota Venkatachelam.

[2] *Avantisundarī* 178-179 This work gives the duration of the reigns of some kings. 183-185

[3] *Harṣacarita Ucchvāsa* VIII

The drama *Mudritakumudacandra* was written by Yaśaścandra on the incident in which the Digambara Kumudacandra was silenced in a debate by the Śvetambara Devasūri. This incident took place in 1124 A.D. Sandhyākaranandin's *Rāmapālacarita* and Jalhaṇa's *Somapālavilāsa* deal with the lives of Rāmapāla and Somapāla respectively. Maṅkha's *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* is valuable for the account of the court-life contained in the last canto.

Kalhaṇa is the greatest historian of India. His *Rājataraṅgiṇī* deals with the history of Kashmir. He studied the *Nīlamatapurāṇa*, edicts and panegyrics of the ancient kings and wrote his chronicle. Eleven works on the history of Kashmir were written before him.[2] He begins with Aśoka and stops with the reign of Jayasiṁha of Kashmir about 1150 A.D. The accounts given by him of the reigns of Aśoka, Pravarasena, Muktāpīḍa, Lalitāditya and others are found to be correct on the evidences from other sources. Kalhaṇa does not appear to have taken any liberty with the dates of kings or durations of their reigns. His descriptions are accurate in regard to food prices, currency, taxation and famine. Śaṅkaravarman's reign was remarkable for his foreign expeditions. Kalhaṇa rises above human vanity and does not hesitate to expose the defects in Kashmir. There were greedy soldiers, intriguing priests, untamed barons and rival ministers. He condemns the petty politics of Kashmir, consisting in treachery, intrigue, murder, suicide and strife. The kingdom suffered much under the rule of the rapacious queen Diddā. He is vehement in his reproach of the soldiers of Kashmir who had withrawn from a battle with the Rājput soldiers whose martial spirit elicited his unstinted admiration. Women appear to have been given equal opportunities in public life as evidenced by the queens Diddā, Sugandhā, Sūryamati and others. The Western writers and historians are not ready to appreciate Kalhaṇa's status as a historian as he believed in the power of evil omens, magic and karma. However, Kalhaṇa is a 'poet of veracity and universality.' He has acquitted himself ably to the standard and equipment of a historian mentioned by himself in the lines :—

श्लाघ्यः स एत्र गुणवान् रागद्वेषवहिष्कृतः ।
भूतार्थकथने यस्य स्थेयस्येव सरस्वती ।।

Rājataraṅgiṇī I 7

---

1. *Vikramāṅkadevacarita* I 69
2. *Rājataraṅgiṇī* I 14-15

The historical records of the later period admit of better interpretation because of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* containing accurate information about the dynasties in Kashmir.

The *Dvyāśrayakāvya*, *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* and the works written under Vīradhavala (C.1220 A.D.) have their own value on contemporary history. Among these, the *Prabhāvakacarita* and *Kīrtikaumudī* contain information on the dynasties of *Chapotka* and *Solaṅki* in Gujarat. The achievements of the kings of the Vijayanagar period are recorded in the *Mathurāvijaya*, *Acyutarāyābhyudaya* and others written during this period. King Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore had his life celebrated in the *Raghunāthābhyudaya* and other works written by his queen and proteges. The *Viśvaguṇādarśa* presents the life of the people in South India in the middle of the 17th century. The *Ānandaraṅgavijayacampu* records the beginnings of the British empire in India. The city of Madras is pictured in the *Sarvadevavilāsa*. Besides these, the allegorical plays like the *Prabodhacandrodaya* present the ways of religious life led by people during the particular periods when those plays were written.

CHAPTER XXV

THEORIES OF POETRY AND DRAMA

With the growth and development of poems and dramas, the composers and the critics felt the need to frame rules both to guide the novices and to check the form and nature of the compositions from becoming unintelligible to posterity. The rules of dramaturgy took precedence over those of the poems. The figures of speech also were given some importance as they were intended to maintain the standard of sentiment. This branch (poetics) came to acquire the name *Alaṅkāra* on account of the importance given to the figures of speech. It is called by the name *Sāhitya* because of the stress it lays on the inseparable relation between word and its meaning. Generally speaking, this branch deals with the following topics :—Theory and definition of poetry, denotations of words, the nature and classification of the characters, sentiment, qualities and blemishes, dramaturgy and figures of speech.

Attempts were made at different periods during the development of this branch to determine what constitutes the essence of poetry and to devise the means to achieve it. The excellence of the poem or drama was looked at from various angles and therefore the results achieved are also varied. Those results formed the basis for the starting of a school of theory on poems and dramas. There arose eight schools under the names *Rīti*, *Guṇa*, *Rasa*, *Dhvani*, *Anumāna*, *Alaṅkāra*, *Vakrokti* and *Aucitya*.

Rīti is literary manner. It is a way of writing. In the early stages, it was associated with a particular part of the country. Thus there were the *Vaidarbhī rīti* prevalent in the Vidarbha country and *Gauḍī rīti* popular in the Gauḍa country. The former was marked by all the excellences, while the latter had exaggeration, force and bombast. Bilhaṇa, the author of the *Vikramāṅkadevacarita*, speaks highly of the former in the following *śloka* :—

अनभ्रवृष्टिः श्रवणामृतस्य सरस्वतीविभ्रमजन्मभूमिः ।
वैदर्भरीतिः कृतिनामुदेति सौभाग्यलाभप्रतिभूःप्रजानाम् ।।

Vikramāṅkadevacarita I 9

Cohesion (*śleṣa*), lucidity (*prasāda*), evenness (*samatā*), sweetness (*mādhurya*), tenderness (*sukumāratā*), explicitness of sense (*artha-vyakti*), floridity (*ojas*), grace (*kānti*), transference (*samādhi*) and elevation of expression (*udāratva*) are the ten qualities which constitute the life of the *Vaidarbhi rīti*. The *Gauḍī rīti* is characterised mostly by the opposite of these. There are some qualities common to both.

Vāmana was the first writer to refer to the soul of poetry and according to him, the *rīti* was the soul of poetry. He added the *Pāñcālī* as the third *rīti*. Later rhetoricians added *Lāṭī*, *Āvantī* and *Māgadhī*, making the total number of *ritis* become six. Daṇḍin and Vāmana were the great exponents of this school. With the rise of the *Rasa* school, this lost its ground and its characterestic features were incorporated in the other schools.

The *Guṇa* school was allied to the *Rīti* school. Vāmana is the first writer to classify the *guṇas* into those of *Śabda* and *Artha*. The former is related to the formation of a composition while the latter is concerned with raising the status of *Rīti*. Thus there are twenty qualities according to Vāmana. In the early period, some rhetoricians recognised only three qualites among the ten viz., *Prasāda*, *Mādhurya* and *Ojas*. Daṇḍin and Vāmana were the exponents of this school. After Vāmana, the *Śabdaguṇas* got merged in the *Alaṅkāras* and the *Arthaguṇas* in *Rasa*.

Rasa is sentiment, a mental feeling. "Sentiment is a condition in the mind of the spectator of a drama, or, we may add, the hearer or reader of a poem produced by the emotions of the characters, and the emotions. Bhāvas are excited by factors which may either be the object of the emotion, as the loved one is in the case of love, or serve to heighten it, as does the spring season."[1] Unlike *Rīti* and *Guṇa* which are primarily connected with the form of the composition, Rasa has a direct appeal to the soul, being the experience of the feeling. Whatever be the nature of the feeling in the ordinary experience of the world, its experience is always pleasant in the case of poems and dramas. Feeling is aroused by the factors called by the names *ālambana* and *uddīpana*. The results of the working of these factors are manifested in the form of glances and other external indications of the emotion experienced. Later these give rise to fainting, fatigue, tremor and others. All these produce a dominant emotion (*sthāyī bhāva*) which, in its final stage of growth, acquires the name of sentiment. The sentiments are many, as the fellings are many and varied. The number of the sentiments was restricted to eight by Bharata.

Vide :—शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणारोद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
वीभत्साद्भुतसंज्ञै चेंत्यष्टै नाटये रसाः स्मृताः ॥

Nāṭyaśāstra VI 15

Later writers recognised *Śānta* as the ninth sentiment. Ascetic elements which have existed from very ancient times should have given rise to this sentiment under the influence of the *Mahābhārata* which is dominated by this sentiment. This was objected to by a number of rhetoricians on the following grounds. Bharata did not speak of it. Its dominant emotion *Śama* is of the nature of the total absence of all feelings and actions. It does not have the general feature of being felt or experienced to the same extent as the other sentiments

---

1. A.B. Keith : History of Sanskrit Literature pp. 372-373

have. Those who have recognised *Śānta* as a sentiment meet these objections by pointing out that Bharata did recognise the place of *Śama* in the drama, though not as one of the factors of dramatic presentation. *Śānta* is not characterised by the absence of feelings and actions. It represents the feeling that is experienced by one in search of truth and tranquillity. There is action even in this stage. This sentiment is experienced like others but with this difference in that it appeals to those who are of spiritualistic bent of mind while others are experienced by the major part of humanity suffering from the ills of the world. Therefore *Sānta* is to be admitted as the ninth *Rasa*. Its scope is restricted to those dramas given to depicting the means to get *Mokṣa e.g.*, allegorical plays. Bharata, Bhoja, Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya were among others the exponents of this school.

The *Dhvani* school is closely allied to the *Rasa* school. The doctrine of *Dhvani* is based on the analysis of words and their meaning. Words have three kinds of denotation viz., primary, secondary and suggestion and are respectively referred to by the words *abidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *vyañjanā*. The secondary one is resorted to when the primary one does not convey any sense, *e.g.*, a station of herdsmen on the Gaṅgā. The third kind is applicable to those cases which convey a sense not diretly conveyed by the words. Here the primary sense is not given up. In other words, what is expressed brings to the mind, in addition to the primary sense, something that is not expressed. In its development, this doctrine appears to have been connected with and was influenced by the doctrine of *Sphoṭa* of the grammarians. According to this school, suggestion is the soul of poetry. A literary piece without suggestion is deemed to be dead. What is suggested may be sentiment or figure of speech. It cannot be expressed by means of words. Its experience comes within the province of personal observation and as such cannot be communicated to others. Such experiences are confined to those persons, who had similar experiences in the previous births and therefore could enjoy them when repeated. When they are to be had through the actors on the stages, they are treated by these men of taste not as belonging to the actors or themselves but as universal. The men of taste derive supreme enjoyment through these experiences had through the stage or by reading the poems. Hence these experiences, though painful in some cases, afford pleasure to the man of taste. Ānandavardhana and Abhinava gupta were the chief exponents of this doctrine. Abhinavagupta simplified it by restricting its scope to sentiment. The qualities (*guṇa*) and the figures of speech are related to sentiment. The literary pieces are grouped under three heads viz., *Dhvanikāvya* dominated by suggestion, *Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya* in which suggestion is given secondary importance and *Citra* devoid of suggestion. Long compounds shall not be used even in prose passages when sentiment is to be suggested.

Apart from the doctrine of suggestion, there prevailed diverse views about the way in which sentiment is experienced. According to Lollaṭa, sentiment belongs to the actor. The spectator has a pleasant experience of it when he finds the actor revealing the mental conditions which originally belonged to the person whose part he plays. According to Bhaṭṭanāyaka, sentiment can neither be produced nor perceived but could be appreciated and experienced through the denotation of words, the ability of the spectator to generalise the particular instance and the capacity of the audience to enjoy it. The views of these two writers did not command any following.

Śaṅkuka held the view that the clever gesticulation of the actor makes it possible for the spectator to infer that the actor is not different from the person whose part he plays. Thus inference is the only mode of experiencing the sentiment. Śaṅkuka is therefore the founder of the *Anumāna* school.

The *Alaṅkāra* school devoted itself to the literary embellishments based on sound and sense and so known as *Śabdālaṅkāra* and *Arthālaṅkāra*. The *Alaṅkāras* are more or less external aids for the literary compositions. Though Bharata, Medhāvirudra and others dealt with them, Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, whose works are extant, are taken as the authoritative exponents of this school. The number of *Alaṅkaras* which were about thirty-eight in the days of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha went on increasing and exceeded two hundred at the hands of later writers.

The *Vakrokti* school is only an offshoot of the Alaṅkāra school. The word '*vakrokti*' means a way of utterance differing from the ordinary mode of speech. The figures of speech are said to gain perfection through this. In the later period, *Vakrokti* came to be treated as a distinct figure of speech. *Vakrokti* is the soul of poetry. Bhāmaha and Kuntaka were the exponents of this school.

The *Aucitya* school laid stress on propriety as the main factor contributing to the excellence of the literary composition. The very life of the poem depends on it. Appropriateness applies to the words, their meaning, qualities, figures of speech, sentiment and all other factors which constitute the poem. This theroy was advocated by Kṣemendra.

The earliest authorities on poetics were Nandikeśvara, Nārada and others. No work written by them on this subject has come down to us. The writer whose work is extant is Bharata who is mentioned by Kālidāsa as having taught the celestial nymphs the dramatic representation displaying the eight sentiments.[1] His date shall be placed about 400 B.C. or even earlier. He is the author of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* dealing with dramaturgy, dancing and music. He speaks of the ten qualities (*guṇas*), and *Rūpaka*, *Upamā*, *Dīpaka* and *Yamaka* as the aids for perfecting sentiment. The defects that are to be avoided are also enumerated. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* which consists of thirty-seven chapters contains a number of interpolated passages. An earliest commentary *Bharataṭikā* by name and of unknown authorship is known to have been written upon it. Mātṛgupta, king Harṣavardhana, Udbhaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Lollaṭa, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinavagupta commented on it. The commentary of Abhinavagupta is the only extant text available among the works of these writers.

---

[1] *Vikramorvaśīya* II 18

The *Agnipurāṇa* contains an account of the topics on poeties. Medhāvivirudra appears to have been a very early authority on poetics. His work is lost but his views are cited by later writers. He and Kumāradāsa, the author of the *Jānakīharaṇa* are mentioned by Rājaśekhara as poets who were born blind.

The authoritative text next in importance to the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin. The long drawn out controversy regarding the priority between Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha has not so far helped either in fixing the priority of one over the other or in determining their dates. Nevertheless, some noteworthy points about this deserve to be mentioned here. Daṇḍin mentions the *Setubandha*[1] and *Bṛhatkathā*.[2] He refers to the river Kāverī,[3] city of Kāñci,[4] and to the countries Cola,[5] Kaliṅga[6] and Avanti.[7] Daṇḍin's illustration of the composition of a stanza in a single consonant betrays the direct influence of Bhāravi[8]. The stanza of Daṇḍin and Bhāravi make use of the same consonant '*n*' and convey an almost identical sense. Daṇḍin refers to a Rājavarman while illustrating *Preyas*.[9] Śaṅkara too refers to a king Rājavarman.[10] There is no king with this name known to Indian history. This shall only prove Daṇḍin and Śaṅkara to have been contemporaries. According to *Saṁkṣepaśaṅkaravijaya*, Saṅkara and Bāṇa were contemporaries.[11] From these, the conclusion that can be drawn is that Daṇḍin was a southerner, in all probaliblity a native of Kāñcī. He was influenced by Bhāravi who lived in Kāñcī. Daṇḍin, Bāṇa and Śaṅkara were contemporaries. Daṇḍin may therefore be assigned to the first half of the seventh century. This date receives support from the feigned criticism of Vijjakā on the first stanza of the *Kāvyādarśa*.

Vide :—चतुर्मुखमुखाम्भोजवनहंसवधूर्मम ।
मानसे रमतां नित्यं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥

Kāvyādarśa I. 1

नीलोत्पलदलश्यामां विज्जकां मामजानता ।
वृथैव दण्डिना प्रोक्तं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥

From the latter stanza, it appears that Daṇḍin did not know the poetess Vijjakā who was the wife of Candrāditya, the eldest son of Pulakeśin II (609-642 A.D.), She may be taken to have lived in the third quarter of the seventh century. The lowermost limit is furnished by the *Kannaḍa* version *Kavirājamārga* of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* whose author was the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarṣa Nṛpatuṅga (C.850 A.D.)

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa* I, 34

[2] *Kāvyādarśa* I 38

[3] " III 166

[4] " III 114

[5] " III 166

[6] " III 165

[7] " II 280

[8] " III 95

[9] " II 279 cf. *Kirātārjunīya* XV 14

[10] *Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya* II. 23

[11] *Saṁkṣepaśaṅkaravijaya* XV 141

Some scholars make Daṇḍin the author of the *Avantisundari*, *Dvisandhāna* and *Kāvyādarśa*. The *Avantisundarī* could not have been composed before the last quarter of the seventh century when Bāṇa's works would have become popular, a reference to which is contained here. A passage[1] in the *Kāvyādarśa* represents a metrical reproduction of a passage conveying the same sense in almost identical expressions and contained in the *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa.[2] If Daṇḍin is admitted to have been influenced here by Bāṇa, he must have lived or written the *Kāvyādarśa* in the last quarter of the seventh century. This date would come into clash with that of Vijjakā (C.650 A.D.) who criticised the opening lines of the *Kāvyādarśa*. Or, Vijjakā must be identified with some other poetess with the same name whose date shall be after 700 A.D. Bhoja, the king of Dh*ārā* (1005-1054 A.D.), who mentioned the *Dvisandhāna* of Daṇḍin and was much indebted to Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* for his eminence in the field of poetics, would have made a passing reference to the *Avantisundarī*, if he had known it to be the work of the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*. Perhaps the *Kalāpariccheda*, for which a reference is made in the *Kāvyādarśa*,[3] represents the third work of Daṇḍin. This work also is not referred to by Bhoja as the work of Daṇḍin. That Daṇḍin is the author of the *Kāvyādarśa* and *Dvisandhāna* could be easily admitted. That he could have also written the *Avantisundarī* cannot be proved beyond dispute.

Daṇḍin's connection with Bhāmaha or his priority over the latter cannot be proved for want of evidences of decisive nature. The passages in the works of both these writers are such as to show that they were criticising each other's view.[4] Or, they must be making references to the views held by the rival schools of which they were the followers. The treatment of the figures of speech by both reveals that they were following an independent line while at the same time following the same scheme.[5] It would be wise to stop arguing on a problem like this bearing in mind the wise saying of Ānandavardhana which runs as follows :—

संवादास्तु भवन्त्येव बाहुल्येन सुमेधसाम् ।
नैकरूपतया सर्वे ते मन्तव्या विपश्चिता ।

Dhvanyāloka IV 1

---

1. *Kāvyādarśa* II 197
2. *Kādambarī*—Śukanāsa's advice to Candrāpīḍa
3. *Kāvyādarśa* III 171
4. *Cf.* ,, I 21-22 with Bhāmahālaṅkāra I 22-23
,, II 244 ,, II 87
5. ,, II 355 ,, III 41
,, II 88, 26 ,, III 35-36 & 43-48

Perhaps *Kāvyādarśa* III, 120, which is attributed to Daṇḍin in the *Sārṅgadhara-paddhati* and cited partially by Bhāmaha in the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* I, 41, would prove a prior date to Daṇḍin.

The *Kāvyādarśa* contains three sections called *paricchedas*. The first section deals with the nature and form of compositions, division of prose into *Kathā* and *Akhyāyikā* and the two styles *Vaidarbhī* and *Gauḍī*. The second section deals with the *Arthālaṅkāras* with a wealth of illustrations. The last section is devoted to the treatment of *Yamaka* in great detail, riddles and defects in compositions. According to Daṇḍin, the figures of speech are of two categories viz., *Svabhāvokti* and *Vakrokti*.[1] *Atiśayokti* is the best among the figures of speech and the basis for all of them.[2] Daṇḍin commands a graceful style to the envy of other rhetoricians.

Bhāmaha, the son of Rakrilagomin, is the author of the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* familiarly known as *Bhāmahālaṅkāra*. He mentions in this work Ramaśarmā and his poem *Acyutottara*, Medhāvin, Śakhavardhana and Nyāsakāra. The *Āśmakavaṁśa*, *Rājamitra* and *Ratnāharaṇa* are the works mentioned by him. Among these, Medhāvin was also known as Medhāvirudra, an authority on poetics. Neither is his work available nor his date determined. Identity of Nyāsakāra is not available, as there were many *Nyāsas* written by different writers. In the *Avantisundarī*, there is a reference to one Ramaśarmā, a learned friend of its author Daṇḍin but he is not known to have written any poem. No clue is available from these references to fix the date of Bhāmaha. There is striking similarity between *Bhāmahālaṅkāra* and Bhaṭṭi's *Rāvaṇavadha*. Bhāmaha seems to criticise Bhaṭṭi (C. 645 A.D.).[3] On the strength of the evidences available, it can be said that Bhāmaha lived about 675 A.D.[4] Besides this work, Bhāmaha is said to have commented on the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* of Vararuci and written a work on prosody.

The *Kāvyālaṅkāra* has six *paricchedas*, the first one dealing with the nature and form of compositions, *Kathā* and *Ākhyāyikā* which division Bhāmaha seeks to maintain and defects of poetry. *Paricchedas II* and *III* are devoted to the treatment of the *Alaṅkāras*. In the 4th and 5th paricchedas, Bhāmaha deals with the defects to be avoided in literary compositions. In the last pariccheda, there are references to points of grammatical and philosophical importance. Bhāmaha is against the division of styles into *Vaidarbhī* and *Gauḍī*. To him *Atiśayokti* in its extended sense is *Vakrokti*. The figurative, coloured and vigorous way of writing adds to the charm of the poem.

Vide :—वाचां वक्रार्थशब्दोक्तिरलंकाराय कल्पते ।

Bhāmahālaṅkāra V 66

He does not appear to have recognised for *Vakrokti* the distinct status of an *Alaṅkāra*. His treatment of the figures of speech has given him an unique place among the later day rhetoricians. His language lacks the polish and grace of Daṇḍin's.

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa* II 363

[2] *Kāvyādarśa* II 214 & 220;

[3] *Cf. Bhāmahālaṅkāra* II 20 and *Bhaṭṭikāvya* XXII 34

[4] *Bhāmahālaṅkāra* is quoted in the *Tattvasaṅgraha* by Śāntarakṣita (705-762 A.D.).

Vāmana was the poet under king Jāyāpiḍa of Kashmir (C. 800 A.D.). He is the author of the *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtras* with his own *Vṛtti* on them. This work contains five chapters, twelve *adhikaraṇas* and 319 *sūtras*. Illustrations are given from the works of other writers. He was influenced by Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. It is he that suggested the question of soul for literary compositions. He added the *Pāñcālī* style to the existing two styles. He mentions Viśākhila as the author of works on arts, Śūdraka, Subaṅdhu related to the son of a Candragupta, Kavirāja and others. Quotations are found taken from the works of Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Māgha, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa Amaru, the poetess Phalguhastinī, Śūdraka, Bhāmaha, Harṣavardhana and others. A passage is quoted from a work *Hariprabodha* by name.

Udbhaṭa, who flourished in Kashmir under the patronage of king Jayāpiḍa (751-782 A.D.) is the author of the *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha* usually called *Udbhaṭālaṅkāra*. He wrote the *Bhāmahavivaraṇa* a commentary on the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha and a poem *Kumārasambhava* similar to Kālidāsa's poem of this name. Both these works are lost to us. The *Udbhaṭālaṅkāra* has six chapters on the *Alaṅkāras*. Udbhaṭa's definitions of many *Alaṅkāras* are similar to and in some cases identical with those of Bhāmaha. He classifies the styles into three viz., *Upanāgarikā* elegant, *Grāmyā* ordinary and *Paruṣā* harsh. He is the earliest writer to lay emphasis on sentiments and the first writer to mention *Śānta* as a sentiment. Pratīhārendurāja (C. 950 A.D.), who commented on the *Udbhaṭālaṅkāra*, did not make any progress over Udbhaṭa.

The doctrine of *Dhvani* was expounded about 820 A.D. in one hundred and twenty verses (*kārikās*). The name of the expounder is not known but *Sahṛdaya* appears to be the title conferred on him. These *kārikās* were commented by Ānandavardhana (C. 850 A.D.) in the *Dhvanyāloka*. This work contains 129 *kārikās* in four sections called *uddyotas* and the *vṛtti* on them by Ānandavardhana. A confusion has risen in the later period regarding the authorship of the *kārikās*, some of them being attributed to the authorship of Ānandavardhana. Besides the citations from the works of others, Ānandavardhana quotes from his own works *Devīśataka*, *Arjunacaritamahākāvya*, *Viṣamabāṇalilā* and *Harivijaya*. All these are lost to us except the first. The last two works were written in *Prākṛta*.

Abhinavagupta (1000 A.D.) wrote a commentary called *Dhvanyālokalocana* on the *Dhvanyāloka*. He is believed to have studied under nineteen teachers, some of them being Bhaṭṭendurāja and Bhaṭṭatauta. He was a great Śaivite of the *Pratyabhijña* school. It is said that he wrote forty-one works on poetics and *Śaivism*. Besides the *Dhvanyālokalocana*, he wrote the *Abhinavabhāratī*, the commentary on Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the *Kāvyakautukavivaraṇa* on Bhaṭṭatauta's *Kāvyakautuka* a work on poetics. The last mentioned work is not extant. On the *Ghaṭakarpara*, the erotic lyric, he is said to have composed a commentary named *Ghaṭakaraparakulakavivṛti*. The *Dhvanyālokalocana* is also called by the names Sahṛdayālokalocana and *Kāvyālokalocana*. It contains citations from a number of works, some among them having been lost. It refers to *Candrikā*, a commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*. The efforts of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta have borne fruit in strengthening the basis of the *Dhvani* theory with the result that the schools of *Guṇa*, *Rīti*, *Anumāna* and *Vakrokti* ceased to have independent existence. Nor did the view of Bhaṭṭanāyaka, the author of the *Hṛdayadarpaṇa*, the lost commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, continue to flourish.

Kuntaka also known as Kuntala (C.1000 A.D.), a younger contemporary of Abhinavagupta and a great exponent of the *Vakrokti* school, is the author of the *Vakroktijīvita* incomplete in three chapters. Through a critical presentation of the *Rīti*, *Rasa*, *Guṇa* and *Alaṅkāra*, he evolved three styles in lieu of the old ones viz., *Sukumāra*, *Vicitra* and *Madhyama*. In this he realised the futility of retaining the old geographical names like *Vaidarbhī*, *Gauḍī*, *etc*. The *Alaṅkāras* and *Rasas* contributed to the excellence of each style in an individual manner. Moreover, he felt that the character of the poet is reflected in his writing and held that each writer had his own literary manner. However broadly speaking, three ways of writing were there. Kālidāsa, Sarvasena the author of the *Harivijaya* and others were masters of the *Sukumāramārga*. Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti and Rājaśekhara were the representatives of the *Vicitramārga*. Bāṇas's *Harṣacarita* stands out as the illustration here. Mātṛgupta, Mayurāja and Mañjīra represented the *Madhyamamārga*. Śaṅkuka's theory of inference is found very ably expounded by Mahimabhaṭṭa in his *Vyaktiviveka* containing three sections. This work, which contains severe criticisms of the views held by Abhinavagupta and Kuntaka, reveals the author's erudition, logical accuracy and deep insight. Mahimabhaṭṭa's other work on poetics called *Tattvoktikośa* is now lost.

Rudraṭa (C. 800 A.D.), also known as Śatānanda, was the son of Bhaṭṭavāmuka. He was unaware of the *Dhvani* theory and is quoted by Rājaśekhara, Dhanika, Abhinavagupta and others. His work *Kāvyālaṅkara* in sixteen chapters deals very elaborately with the figures of speech and sound, *Vakrokti* and the styles by adding the *Lāṭī* as the fourth style. The author deals with six languages viz., *Prakṛta*, *Saṁskṛta*, *Māgadhī*, *Paiśācī*, *Śaurasenī* and *Apabhraṁśa*. He mentions *Śānta* as the ninth and *Preyās* as the tenth sentiments. It is at the hands of the Kashmirian rhetoricians Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa, Bhaṭṭatauta and Abhinavagupta that *Śānta* came to occupy a very prominent place in the dramas.

The dramatist Rājaśekhara (C.900 A.D.) is the author of the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* in eighteen chapters. Instead of dealing with the topics of poetics, this work contains a mine of information about everything connected with the poets and poetesses. It is a handbook for poets. The author mentions the views of his wife Avantisundarī, Pālyakīrti, Śyāmadeva, Maṅgala and others on the topics connected with literature. He makes references to the *Śaivasiddhānta* and *Pāñcarātra* systems of religions. The *Alaṅkāra* system is the seventh *Vedāṅga* and the fifteenth *vidyāsthāna*. Rudrabhaṭṭa's *Śṛṅgāratilaka* and *Rasakalikā* deal with sentiment. *Śānta* is mentioned as the ninth sentiment. The *Tripuravadha* is mentioned in the former work as the author's composition. As the earliest reference to the *Śṛṅgāratilaka* is traced in the *Kāvyānuśāsana* of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.). Rudrabhaṭṭa cannot be identified with Rudraṭa and is to be taken to have flourished about the beginning of the eleventh century.

Dhanañjaya, the son of Viṣṇu, treated dramaturgy in the *Daśarūpa* containing four *prakāśas*. He was patronised by king Muñja of Dhārā (C.990 A.D.). The work contains three hundred *kārikās*. It was commented by Dhanika, son of Viṣṇu, probably brother of Dhanañjaya in the *Avaloka* usually called *Daśarūpāvaloka* which was written after Muñja's death about 1000 A.D. The commentary is valuable for the citations it contains from the works of others. Dhanika's work *Kāvyanirṇaya* on poetics quoted here is now lost. Both the text and the commentary have become very popular and authoritative works on dramaturgy. The authors of these two works vehemently opposed the recognition given to *Śānta* as a sentiment.

Bhoja, the king of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.), was a patron of learning and himself an accomplished man of letters. He distinguished himself in many branches of study by composing works representing them. In the field of poetics, he is accredited with the authorship of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* and *Śṛṅgāraprakāsa*. The former is a voluminous work in five chapters. It discusses the merits and defects of poetry, figures of speech and sentiments. *Āvantī* and *Māgadhī* are two more styles added to the list of four maintained by Rudraṭa. The citations in this work are helpful for settling the chronology of poets. The latter work has thirty-six chapters. The first-twelve chapters are devoted to a study of the *Mahākāvya*, drama, qualities and defects of poetry. The remaining chapters are devoted to the treatment of the sentiments, among which the sentiment of love is given prominence.

The *Aucityavicāracarcā* of Kṣemendra (C.1050 A.D.) of Kashmir advocates the doctrine of *Aucitya*. He does not hesitate to point the defects of the poets, however eminent they might have been. He is the favourite of none. He finds fault with his own usages. His other work *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa* in five chapters gives useful information for the ways and means to be adopted for becoming a poet and maintaining that position. He cites passages from numerous writers whose works are only names to us, as their works are lost.

The doctrine of *Dhvani* received fresh treatment after silencing the opponents by Mammaṭa (C. 1100 A.D.). Along with Allaṭa, also known as Alaka, he wrote the *Kāvyaprakāśa* in ten chapters called *ullāsa*. This work deals with all the topics except dramaturgy.

It is held that Mammaṭa wrote up to *Parikara* in the ninth chapter and the remaining part of the work was written by Allaṭa. The work is written in the form of *kārikās* with the author's comment on them. The *Kāvyaprakāśa* is a standard work on poetics and its popularity is attested by more than seventy commentaries written upon it. Mammaṭa is the author also of another work called *Śabdavyāpāravicāra* on the denotation of words.

Hemacandra's (1088-1172 A.D.) *Kāvyānuśāsana* with his own commentary *Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi* on it covers the entire field of poetics. Ruyyaka also known as Rucaka, wrote, about 1150 A.D., the *Alaṅkārasarvasva* in the form of *sūtras* with a commentary on them. Some scholars are of opinion that the *sūtras* were written by Ruyyaka and the commentary belongs to the authorship of Ruyyaka's pupil Maṇkhaka, the author of the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita*. A scientific mode of defining and examining the figures of speech is adopted here. Besides this work, Ruyyaka has to his credit commentaries on Mahimabhaṭṭa's *Vyaktiviveka* and Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa*, *Sāhityamīmāṁsā*, *Nāṭakamīmāṁsā*, *Alaṇkārānusāriṇī*, *Sahṛdayalīlā* and the *Harṣacaritavārttika* a commentary on Bāṇas *Harṣacarita*. The *Sahṛdayalīlā* gives an account of the mode of life which a man of taste is expected to lead.

Vāgbhaṭa, the son of Soma a Jain, is the author of a work known as *Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra* after his name which has five chapters on the form of compositions, languages, *Guṇas*, *Alaṅkāras*, sentiment and conventions of poets. The author belongs to the beginning of the 13th century A.D., when the *Rasaratnapradīpikā* on sentiments was written by Allarāja. About 1250 A.D., Jayadeva, the dramatist dealt with all topics except dramaturgy in the *Candrāloka* written in a lucid and elegant style. To the same period belongs the *Bhāvaprakāśana* in ten chapters by Śāradātanaya who treats the subject of poetics closely following Bharata, noticing the divergent views. He recognises sentiment as the soul of poetry. *Śānta* is denied a place among sentiments. The sentiment of love is developed on the lines of Bhoja. At the end of the century, was written another *Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra* by Vāgbhaṭa son of the Jain Nemikumāra. This work is in the form of *sutras* with his own commentary *Alaṅkāratilaka* on them. About the same period, the entire field of poetics was covered in the *Alaṅkārasārasaṅgraha* by Amṛtānandayogin.

Siṅgabhūpāla, a Reddi prince, who lived about 1400 A.D., is known as the author of the *Rasārṇavasudhākara* in three chapters on sentiment and dramaturgy. Some critics hold that it was written by his protege Viśveśvara. On sentiments were written the *Rasamañjarī* and *Rasataraṅgiṇī* by Bhānudatta of the same period. About the same period, Viśvanātha, a native of Orissa, dealt with the entire field of poetics in the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. Besides the profuse quotations from the works of others, it contains citations from the other works of the author such as *Raghuvilāsamahākāvya*, *Kuvalāyāśvacarita* *a Prākṛta* poem, *Prabhāvatī* and *Candrakalā* two *Nāṭikās*, and *Narasiṁharājavijaya* a historical poem. All these works are not extant. The *Alaṅkaras* were treated in the *Sāhityacintāmaṇi* by Vemabhūpāla (C. 1420 A.D.), the patron of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa. Vidyābhūśaṇa's *Sāhityakaumudī* belongs to the same period.

In the latter half of the 16th century A.D., Rūpagosvāmin composed the *Ujjvalanīlamaṇi* with illustrations in praise of Kṛṣṇa. This work was commented by Jīvagosvāmin. During the same period, Appayadīkṣita came to be an authority on *Alaṅkāra* by writing the *Kuvalayānanda*, *Citramīmāṁsā* and *Vṛttivārtika*. The first work is a commentary on chapter V of Jayadeva's Candrāloka. It is very popular in South India. The second work contains a scientific treatment of the figures of speech and is incomplete. The last work is on the denotation of words. To the same period belongs the *Alaṅkāraśekhara* of *Keśavamiśra* who gives some useful advice to the poets. *Maithilī* is the name of a style according to one Śrīpāda whose view is cited here. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha* of Kavikarṇapūra belonged to this period.

Jagannātha Paṇḍita (1590-1665), the author of the *Bhāminīvilāsa* acquired high reputation through the *Rasagaṅgādhara* which is a standard work on *Alaṅkāras*. The figures of speech are defined and discussed with illustrations taken from the works of the author. The views of the predecessors are mentioned. Jagannātha is a bold and independent writer holding his own views much against those of eminent authorities whom he does not hesitate to criticise. He gives a vehement criticism of the doctrine of *Dhvani* and maintains the theory of sentiment. His sense of judgement becomes clear from his definition of poetry expressed in the line रमणीयार्थप्रतिपादकः शाब्दः काव्यम्. The *Citramīmāṁsā* of Appayadīkṣita is vehemently and adversely criticised by him in the *Citramīmaṁsākhaṇḍana*. The *Kāvyapradīpa* of Govinda and the *Kāvyadarpaṇa* of Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita with his own commentary *Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi* on it belong to this period. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha* and *Alaṅkārakarṇābharaṇa* are the works of Viśveśvara who lived at the beginning of the 18th century.

The patrons of learning and their achievements formed the subject-matter of certain compositions on poetics. The authors of such compositions framed all the illustrations in praise of their patrons. The earliest work of this kind is the *Ekāvalī* of Vidyādhara written in praise of Narasimha king of Utkala and Kaliṅga. This was written about 1300 A.D. when Vidyānātha eulogised his patron Pratāparudradeva of Warangal in the *Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūśaṇa*. The greatness of Prince Siṅgabhūpāla was celebrated by Viśveśvara (C. 1400 A.D.) in the *Camatkāracandrikā*. The *Alaṅkāraratnākara* of Yajñanārāyaṇa is in praise of king Raghunātha Naik of Tanjore (C. 1620 A.D.). In the 18th century, Nañjarāja and Rāmavarman of Travancore had their glories recorded respectively by Nṛsiṁhakavi holding the title *Abhinava-*

kālidāsa in the *Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa* and by Sadāśivamakhin in the *Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa* respectively.

Valuable information about the definitions in dramaturgy is contained in the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* of Sāgaranandin. The numerous citations given here help not only in settling the chronology of poets but also in getting information about many compositions now lost. The *Praśnomālā* of Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa of the seventeenth century is a peculiar work on literary criticism. Some problems about the text of standard works are raised and answered.

Some of the rhetoricians discuss the aim and purpose of writing poetry. Wealth and fame are considered to be the aims. The four pursuits of life are also suggested by some writers.

Vide :—काव्यं यशसेऽर्थकृते व्यवहारविदे शिवेतरक्षतये ।
सद्यः परनिर्वृतये कान्तासंमिततयोपदेशयुजे ।।

Kāvyaprakāśa I,.

This is illustrated by Mammaṭa by citing Kālidāsa who got fame, Bāṇa who got wealth and Mayura who was cured of his disease.

Inspiration, flawless learning and intensive application are mentioned as the means or aids for writing poetry. In the absence of inspiration, one can make a name with the help of the other two.[1] Hemacandra recommends a novice to take three quarters from the works of great poets and complete the other one by his own effort. Similar instructions are given by Kṣemendra in the *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*. The result of these instructions has been the repetition of ideas and expressions of earlier poets.

The poets had to prove their worth in the gathering of scholars. Kālidāsa, Haricandra and others were examined in Ujjain. Upavarṣa, Pāṇini, Vāraruci, Patañjali and others were tested in Pāṭaliputra.[2] Sometimes a poet's ability was tested by asking him to compose a stanza without premeditation on a given topic, to complete the stanza left unfinished by others and to solve riddles. The accounts of such incidents are given in the *Bhojaprabandha* of Ballālasena, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga and *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* of Maṅkha. The *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana* was written by the Buddhist Dharmadāsa on riddles. It belongs to the beginning of the 13th century. A poet, who sought patronage under a prince or an assembly of learned men, was expected to be familiar with a wide range of subjects so as to please the gathering composed of men of diverse tastes. The *Kāmasūtra* gives useful advice about the equipment of a poet.

---

[1] *Kāvyādarśa* I 103-104

[2] *Kāvyamimāṁsā* chapter X

CHAPTER XXVI

SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES AND GRAMMAR

The word *śāstra* is used to denote the branch of study which is treated on a scientific basis. It means that by which something is taught. शिष्यतेऽनेनेति शास्त्रम्। It was originally applied to those subjects of study which were closely connected with the Vedic texts. When the topics connected with the Vedic literature came to be discussed, there must have risen the necessity to have them grouped together and treated separately. Some designation must have been given to this group and this must have been frequently referred to for purposes of classification and guidance. Thus the *śāstra* must have taken its rise. Later on, all other subjects came to be dealt with on a similar basis and there arose a *śāstra* under each head. This meant the specialisation of a branch of study which however included the understanding of the general principles of the various branches of study. Thus arose branches under the names *Vaiyākaraṇas, Nairuktas, Yājñikas etc.*

The cardinal doctrines of a *śāstra* are found recorded in the form of aphorisms (*sūtras*). This form was adopted mainly with a view to minimise the burden on the memory of the readers and pupils. The aphorisms, which are brief and enigmatic, are understandable only with the help of the expositions offered for them by the preceptors. The rise of the various branches and the views maintained therein sometimes antagonistic to each other aroused in the students doubts regarding the true nature of the doctrines taught to them. Such doubts were cleared by their preceptors who expounded their own systems maintaining the soundness of the doctrines as against those preached by the rival schools. All these were embodied in the form of expositions of the aphorisms which came to be called *bhāṣya*. Counter arguments raised by the rival schools on the *bhāṣyas* led to a critical study of these problems recorded in the form of works which came to be called *Vārtika* or *Vṛtti*.

Vide :—उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तानां चिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते ।
तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुर्वार्तिकज्ञा मनीषिणः ।।

Each *śāstra* began to grow with the addition of more and more matter as discussions continued from time to time. For the sake of clarity, the main doctrines were put together in the form of memorable verses (*kārikās*) which were usually commented by the authors themselves.

From time to time, discussions used to be held in the courts of kings and the assemblies of the learned in which the participants were the leading exponents of the various *śāstras*. The nature of the conduct of such debates was in a large measure responsible for the scholastic and dialectic type of this literature. Generally the *śāstraic* literature is written in prose. Those works which were written after the twelfth century A.D. abound in very long compounds. Verses are used for drawing a conclusion or to lay stress on any point of dispute. Verbs are hardly used in the treatises written in the later period. All the *śāstras*, with the exception of the heterodox (*nāstika*) systems, trace their origin to the *Vedas*.

The four *Vedas*, with their six supplements, *Purāṇas*, *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṁsa* and *Dharmaśāstra* form into fourteen branches of learning.

Vide :—पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥

Yājñavalkyasmṛti I 3

The *Āyurveda*, *Dhanurveda*, *Gāndharvaveda* and *Arthaśāstra* are the secondary *Vedas* (*Upavedas*) and represent the four branches. On the whole, there are eighteen branches of sciences (*śāstras*).

GRAMMAR

Among the supplements of the *Vedas*, the science of grammar occupies an important position. While it is a part of literature in other languages, it is an independent subject of study in *Saṁskṛta* and at a later date in *Prākṛta* also. Its origin is to be traced to the Vedic literature. Its development was greatly influenced by the *Nirukta* and *Śikṣā*, the two Vedic supplements.

Many were the grammarians who attempted to regulate the use of words from very early times. They recorded their views in the form of works. All of them are lost except that of Pāṇini. Pāṇini was born at Śālātura near Attock as the son of Dākṣī. His date is fixed about 700 B.C. According to the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, he was a pupil of Varṣa, his co-pupils being Kātyāyana, Vyāḍi and Indradatta. He was not satisfied with the education he received under Varṣa and therefore propitiated Śiva who taught him the fourteen comprehensive (*pratyāhāra*) *sūtras*. Pāṇini developed them into the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. He availed himself of the results of the writers who preceded him, invented some new technical terms, rules of interpretations, suffixes and others. The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has eight chapters and about four thousand *sūtras*. By using algebraic symbols, elliptical statements (*pratyāhāras*) and by omitting words which could be conveniently supplied from the previous aphorisms, Pāṇini has achieved brevity. He has analysed forms with great acumen. His Aśṭādhyāyī is 'a monument at once of encyclopaedic research and technical perfection'. He wrote also the *Dhātupāṭha* a list of roots, *Gaṇapāṭha* a list of words and *Uṇādisūtras* dealing with the derivation of words. It is held that Kātyāyana revised the *Uṇādisūtras* while some scholars attribute their authorship to Kātyāyana himself.

The *Aṣṭādhyāyi* was criticised by later writers but their works are now lost. Vyāḍi is said to have commented on Pāṇini's system in the *Saṅgraha* containing one lakh of stanzas. Patañjali cites this work which is also now lost. Kātyāyana who lived between 500 and 350 B. C. commented on Pāṇini's work by writing the *Vārtika* metrical and prose in form. He attempts to correct, modify and supplement the work of Pāṇini. He offers his own solutions in some cases and in some others, he removes the aphorisms. He is identified with Vararuci who wrote the *Liṅgānuśāsana*, *Vararucisaṅgraha* in twenty-five *kārikās* on case-constructions, compounds, verbs and nominal formation, a lexicon, *Puṣpasūtras* and a poem called *Vararucikāvya.* Whether all these were written by one and the same Vararuci is yet to be proved.

The next grammarian whose work is available is Patañjali who lived about 150 B.C. and wrote the *Mahābhāṣya.* It is based on the *Saṅgraha* of Vyāḍi. Patañjali offers his own desiderata (*iṣṭi*) on Pāṇini's *sūtras.* Very often he defends Pāṇini from the attacks of Kātyāyana. His style is lively and simple and has been cited for its fine prose. It is called *Mahābhāṣya* both on account of the size and matter contained there. Hence is current the saying "महाभाष्यं वा पठनीयम्. महाराज्यं वा शासनीयम्"। Patañjali, who was the incarnation of Ādiśeṣa, was born at Gonarda. He is the author of works on *Yoga* and medicine which contention is denied by the Western scholars.

Till the fourth century A.D., no original work appears to have been written. The *Mahabhāṣya* was the text that was popular till this period. Bhartṛhari (C. 400 A.D.) is the author of a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* called *Mahābhāṣyapradīpikā* which is incomplete. He is the author of another independent work *Vākyapadīya* dealing with the doctrine of *Sphoṭa* and *Śabdādvaita.* It has three sections named *Āgamakāṇḍa*, *Vākyakāṇḍa* and *Padakāṇḍa* dealing respectively with the *Sphoṭa*, sentence and word. He was the pupil of Vasurāta, a contemporary and opponent of the Buddhist philosopher Vasubandhu (C. 350 A.D.).

Jayāditya and Vāmana commented on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini by writing the *Kāśikā.* Jayāditya commented on the first five *adhyāyas* and Vāmana on the remaining portion. I-tsing, the Chinese pilgrim, who visited India in 672 A.D., attests to the popularity of this work. This enables us in placing the work in the sixth century A.D. It was commented by Jinendrabuddhi, a Jain scholar in the *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā* familiarly known as the *Nyāsa.* Jinendrabuddhi, who was also known as Pujyapāda Devanandin, may be taken to have lived in the seventh century. In the eleventh century, the *Kāśikā* was commented by Haradatta in the *Padamañjarī.*

The *Mahābhāṣya* was commented in the eleventh century by Jaiyaṭa's son Kaiyaṭa in the *Pradīpa* which had two commentaries viz., *Uddyota* of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa who lived in the later part of the 17th century and *Uddyotana* of Annambhaṭṭa (C. 1700 A.D.).

The study of the *Saṁskṛta* grammar was simplified by Dharmakīrti, a Buddhist monk of Ceylon, who wrote the *Rūpāvatāra* changing the order of Pāṇini's *sūtras* suitably. His date is said to be in the latter part of the twelfth century. To the authorship of the Buddhist Śaraṇadeva is attributed the *Durghaṭavṛtti* written in 1173 A.D. to prove the correctness of the expressions and usages of eminent poets. The *Rūpamālā*, dealing with the forms current in usage, was written by Vimalasarasvatī in the 14th century.

Rāmacandra (C.1450 A.D.) wrote the *Prakriyākaumudī* rearranging the *sūtras* of Pāṇini for the benefit of the beginners. The *Prakriyāsarvasva* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (C. 1600 A.D.), the author of the *Nārāyaṇīya*, represents an attempt to serve the same purpose. Appayadīkṣitā's (C. 1600 A.D.) *Pāṇinivādanakṣatramālā* discusses certain controversial topics in grammar.

Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita was the greatest grammarian in the 17th century A.D. It is said that he became a pupil of Appayadīkṣita and studied Vedānta under him. Following the model of the *Prakriyākaumudī*, he wrote the *Siddhāntakaumudī* which has outshone all the earlier works on grammar. He wrote the *Prauḍhamanoramā* a commentary on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, the *Śābdakaustubha* a commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Liṅgānuśāsanavṛtti* a commentary on the *Liṅgānuśāsana* a work of Pāṇini on the genders of nouns and *Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana* a metrical work summarising the philosophical doctrines of grammar. The *Siddhāntakaumudī* was abridged in the *Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī* and *Laghusiddhāntakaumudi* by Varadarāja (C. 1650 A.D.), pupil of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. During the same period, Koṇḍubhaṭṭa, nephew of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, wrote the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣana* a commentary on the *Vaiyakaraṇamatonmajjana* of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.

Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, a pupil of Haridīkṣita the grandson of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, lived towards the end of the 17th century. The *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* and *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara* are the commentaries written by him on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. His *Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota* is the commentary on Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*. On the philosophy of grammar, he wrote the *Mañjūṣā*, *Laghumañjūṣā* and *Paramalaghumañjūṣā* varying in extent. He gives a masterly exposition of the doctrine of *Sphoṭa* in the *Sphoṭavāda*. His *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* gives a lucid exposition of the canons of interpretation (*paribhāṣās*) recognised in the system of grammar. Apart from these works, he wrote on *Yoga*, *Dharmaśāstra* and *Alaṅkāra*. His pupil Payaguṇḍa Vaidyanātha commented on the works of his immediate predecessors. The study of the *Siddhāntakaumudī* was made easier by the writing of the scholarly and critical commentary *Tattvabodhinī* by Jñānendrasarasvatī (C. 1750 A.D.) and of the exhaustive and simple commentary *Bālamanoramā* by Vāsudevadīkṣita of the same period.

The *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* enumerating the indeclinable words was composed by Kṣīrasvāmin (C. 1120 A.D.). To the authorship of Sāyaṇa, brother of Mādhava (C. 1350 A.D.) of Vijayanagar, is attributed the *Dhātuvṛtti*, which came to be associated with the name of his brother Mādhava, as *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti*. This work gives the forms of the roots in the various tenses together with their derivatives.

The *Liṅgānuśāsana* deals with the gender of the nouns. There are many works with this name attributed to the authorship of Pāṇini, Vararuci, Śabarasvāmin, Harṣavardhana and others. Similarly, the *Uṇādisūtras* containing the rules for deriving all the words from roots, the *Phiṭsūtras* dealing with accent, and the *Gaṇapāṭhas* containing lists of words brought under the same category are attributed to the authorship of Pāṇini. The *Phiṭsūtras* are ascribed to the authorship of Śantanu, Śāntanavācārya and others.

SPHOṬA

With a view to raise the system of grammar to the status of phisophy, the grammarians formulated the theory of *Sphoṭa* which can be summed up as follows. The letters in a word cannot convey any sense by themselves or when grouped together, for as soon as the letters are uttered, they are destroyed and by the time the last letter is uttered, the previous letters do not exist. The letters do not therefore convey any sense. Something other than the letters is to be admitted as capable of conveying the sense. The grammarians recognise for this purpose *Sphoṭa* which makes clear the sense.

स्फुटत्यथोऽस्मादिति स्फोटः ।

Nāgeśabhaṭṭa : *Sphoṭavāda*

That is, it reveals the sense which is not expressed by the letters. It is only one, all-pervasive and eternal. *Vaikharī*, *Madhyamā*, *Paśyantī* and *Parā* are the four main stages of *Sphoṭa* through which the letters pass when uttered.

Patañjali knew this doctrine. According to Nāgeśabhaṭṭa Sphoṭāyana was the founder of this doctrine. Bhartṛhari is the earliest writer to give a full and detailed treatment to this doctrine in the *Vākyapadīya*. The Brahman appears in the form of words. This appearance is illusory. There is identity between the Brahman and the words which are transient.

Vide :—अनादिनिधनं ब्रह्म शब्दतत्त्वं यदक्षरम् ।
विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः ॥

Vākyapadīya I. 1

The utterance of a word is the manifestation of consciousness which is designated by the word *sphoṭa*. The words are not mere sounds. They have real form which is subtle and far beyond the range of perception. The use of correct words amounts to doing *Dharma*. *Sphoṭa* is identical with the Brahman. On account of this doctrine, the system of grammar came to be designated as *Śabdādvaita* and the grammarians, like the musicians, became the worshippers of the *Śabdabrahman* or *Nādabrahman*. The *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Maṇḍanamiśra (615-695 A.D.) deals with this doctrine.

SCHOOLS OF GRAMMAR OTHER THAN PĀṆINI'S

Long after Pāṇini wrote the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, a need was felt to simplify the voluminous work of Pāṇini to meet the popular demand. The adherents of the Buddhist, Jain and other faiths evolved, out of the the *Aṣṭtādhyāyī*, various systems to suit their own needs. Thus there arose a number of schools most of them opposed to the Vedic religion and have dropped therefore the Vedic section in the system of Pāṇini. They have their own *Dhātupāṭha*, *Gaṇapāṭha*, *Uṇādisūtras* and *Liṅgānuśāsana*. Response only from a section of the people and their out-spoken anti-*Pāṇinīyan* outlook made these systems less popular. They flourished under the support of the followers of the particular religions for a short period. Most of them have few followers and are known only from the treatises written on them.

Among these schools, the earliest is the *Kātantra* school· Śaravarman also known as Śarvavarman, an opponent of Guṇādhya, simplified the *Saṁskṛta* grammar. He worshipped Kumāra who revealed to him a simpler system of grammar. It came to be called *Kātantra*, *Kaumāra* as it was revealed by Kumāra and *Kālāpa* from the feather of the peacock which Śaravarman held in the hand when he approached Kumāra. The date of this grammar can be placed in the first century B.C. It has four books containing 1400 *sūtras* arranged as in the *Prakriyākaumudī*. It became popular in Kashmir and Ceylon. It has commentaries by Durgasiṁha (C.700 A.D.), the *Bālabodhinī* of Bhaṭṭa Jayaddhara, the *Nyāsa* of Ugrabhūti and the *Kātantravṛttiprakāśa* of Karmadhara.

The Buddhist Candragomin, the author of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, was the founder of the *Cāndra* school. He must have lived before 500 A.D., as his influence is found on the *Kāśikā*. The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* has six chapters and 3100 *sūtras*. This work together with ten others of this school was rendered into *Tibetan*. This school became popular in Ceylon where it was recast in the 13th century by a Buddhist priest named Kāśyapa who wrote the *Bālāvabodha* on the system.

The *Jainendra* school traces its origin to the Jaina Mahāvīra who is said to have answered certain questions put to him by Indra. These when recorded gave rise to a new school of grammar which owed its name to Jina and Indra. The original text has come down in two versions one of seven hundred *sūtras* and the other of three hundred *sūtras.* The technical terms are more difficult than those in Pāṇini's system. Pūjyapāda Devanandin, identified with Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the *Nyāsa* on the *Kāśikā*, is said to be the founder of the *sūtras.* Except for the two commentaries on them one by Abhayanandin (750 A.D.) and the other by Somadeva (C.1050 A.D.), there is no work to represent this system. The *Pañcavastu* of recent date and of unknown authorship is a recast of the original texts. This school was popular with the *Digambara* Jains.

The *Śākaṭāyana* school was founded in the ninth century A.D. by the *Svetāmbara* Jain Śākaṭāyana who wrote the *Śabdānuśāsana* with his own commentary on it called *Amoghavṛtti.* It has four chapters containing 3200 *sūtras* arranged as in the *Prakriyākaumudī.* The system was recast in the eleventh century by Dayāpāla who wrote the *Rūpasiddhi* and in the fourteenth century by Abhayacandra who wrote the *Prakriyāsaṅgraha.*

Bhoja, king of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.), is the author of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* containing more than six thousand *sūtras.* It has eight *adhyāyas* on the model of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī.* The author incorporated the *Vārtikas*, *Uṇādisūtras* and *Paribhāṣas* into the body of the work in order to make the system easier for study. His attempt is not anti-*Pāṇinīyan*, as he was the follower of the Vedic religion. He has framed his own *sūtras* for an easier attempt to study *Saṁskṛta.*

The *Jaumara* school was founded by Kramadīśvara in the eleventh century who wrote the *Saṁkṣiptasāra* in the form of *sūtras* distributed among eight *pādas* together with his commentary named *Rasavatī.* The commentary was revised by a king named Jūmaranandin. Hence the name of the system. The *Saṁkṣiptasāra* represents an abridged version of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī.* This was commented in the twelfth century by Goyīcandra in the *Goyīcandrikā.*

The founder of the *Hemacandra* school was the Jain Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.). His *Śabdānuśāsana* has 4500 *sūtras* in eight chapters, the last chapter dealing with the *Prākṛta* grammar. It was commented by the author himself in the *Bṛhadvṛtti* and by Meghavijaya (C.1650 A.D.) in the *Śabdacandrikā.* The *Bṛhadvṛtti* was commented by Devendrasūri of uncertain date in the *Haimalaghunyāsa.*

The *Sārasvata* school took its rise to meet the demand of the Muslim rulers. Brevity, simplicity of treatment and absence of the difficult and out of the way forms characterise this grammar. The basic *sūtras* fourteen in number were revealed by Goddess Sarasvatī and hence the name of the system. The number of original *sūtras* is seven hundred. They are said to have been written by one Narendra. *Anubhūtisvarūpācārya*, who lived in the second half of the thirteenth century A.D., is believed to have received the *sūtras* from Sarasvatī and by including three hundred more *sūtras* commented on them in the *Sārasvataprakriyā.* Fifteen commentaries were written on the *Sārasvataprakriyā.* The *Maṇḍanabhāṣya* of Maṇḍana, and the *Siddhāntacandrikā* of Rāmacandrāśrama (C. 1550 A.D.) are some among them. The *Dhātupāṭha* for this school was prepared by Haraṣkīrti (C. 1550 A.D.). This school was popular till the time of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.

The *Bopadeva* school has for its text the *Mugdhabodha* of Bopadeva who lived in the thirteenth century A.D. The *Mugdhabodha* contains the aphorisms and the commentary on them by Bopadeva himself. This school is marked by simplicity of treatment and the religious element. The *Mugdhabodha* was commented by Rāmatarkavāgīśa. To Bopadeva's authorship is attributed the *Kavikalpadruma* with his own commentary *Kāmadhenu* on it. This work contains a list of roots arranged according to their endings.

The *Saupadma* school was founded by Padmanābhabhaṭṭa of the fourteenth century A.D. who remodelled the greater part of Pāṇini's grammar by writing the *Saupadmavyākaraṇa* with his own commentary *Saupadmapañjikā.*

The *Harināmāmṛta* of Rūpagosvāmin (C. 1520 A.D.), a pupil of Caitanya, shows the author's attempt to present grammar in a sectarian spirit. Similar in nature are the *Harināmāmṛta* of Jīvagosvāmin of the same date and the *Caitanyāmṛta* of unknown authorship. Contrasted from these works glorifying Kṛṣṇa is the *Prabodhacandrikā* by Bālarāmapañcānana in praise of Śiva.

The *Prākṛta* grammar had its own development along with the *Saṁskṛta* grammar. The earliest grammar on *Prākṛta* is the *Prākṛtaprakāśa* of Vararuci whose identity is not established. In the first nine chapters, it deals with the *Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛta* and with the *Paiśācī, Māgadhī* and *Śaurasenī* in the next three chapters. Since *Apabhraṁśa* is not treated, this work may be taken to have been written before 500 A.D. It is commented by the rhetorician Bhāmaha (C.675 A.D.) in the *Manoramā* except for the last chapter and Rāmapāṇivāda of the eighteenth century in the *Prākṛtaprakāśavṛtti.* Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka's (C. 1150 A.D.) *Śrīcihnakāvya* contains illustrations for the rules framed in the *Prākṛtaprakāśa.*

The *Prākṛtasūtras* are attributed to the authorship of Vālmīki who cannot be identical with the author of the Rāmāyaṇa, since these deal with *Mahārāṣṭrī, Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paiśācī, Cūlikā* and *Apabhraṁśa.* These *sūtras* which are 1086 in number were commented by Trivikrama of the fourteenth century in the *Prākṛtasūtravṛtti.* Some scholars attribute the authorship of the *sūtras* to this Trivikrama. The *Prākṛtasūtras* of Hemacandra form part of the last chapter in his *Śabdānuśāsana.* Hemacandra deals with the *Jain Mahārāṣṭrī* and *Ārṣa Prākṛta*, besides others.

Trivikrama, the author of the *Prākṛtasūtravṛti*, wrote an independent work with the name *Prākṛtaśabdānuśāsana.* The *Prākṛta-*

rūpāvatāra is the work of Siṁharāja of the same period. The grammar of the six *Prākṛta* dialects viz., *Mahārāṣṭrī*, *Māgadhī*, *Saurasenī*, *Paiśācī*, *Cūlikāpaiśācī* and *Apabhraṁśa* was written by Lakṣmīdhara (C. 1580 A.D.) in the *Saḍbhāṣācandrikā* and by Bālasarasvatī (C. 1700 A.D.) in the *Saḍbhāṣāvivaraṇa*. The *Prākṛtavyākaraṇasūtra* of one *Seṣanāga* was commented by one Laṅkeśvara also called Rāvaṇa in the *Prākṛtakāmadhenu* which must have been written before the 17th century when Rāmatarkavāgīśa wrote the *Prākṛtakalpataru* under its influence. The last mentioned work influenced Mārkaṇḍeya of the same century in writing the *Prākṛtasarvasva*. The *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa* of one Candra is of uncertain date.

CHAPTER XXVII

PROSODY AND LEXICOGRAPHY

PROSODY

The *Sāṅkhyāyanaśrautasūtra*, *Nidānasūtra*, *Ṛkprātiśākhya*, *Anukramaṇīs* of Kātyāyana and others deal with the metres of the Vedic texts. Prosody has a continued development in the classical period. Metre is of two kinds viz., *Vṛtta* and *Jāti*. The former is regulated by '*gaṇas*' or groups of three syllables, the difference between the groups being accounted for by the prosodial instants being short or long in each syllable. It may be uniform (*sama*), the number of syllables in each quarter of the stanza remaining the same or uneven (*viṣama*), the number differing in the four quarters of the stanza. The *Jāti* is regulated by the syllabic instant the unit being that of a short vowel. The caesuras are to be marked at definite places. The Vedic metres recur in the *Mahābhārata*. Most of them have disappeared in the classical period and in their places many new metres have sprung up.

The earliest texts of the early classical period are the *Chandaḥsūtra* of Piṅgala and *Jayadevachandas* of Jayadeva. They are written using the algebraic symbols as in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. They do not deal with the metres known in the classical period.

To Kāḷidāsa's authorship are wrongly attributed the *Vṛttaratnāvalī* and *Śrutabodha*. The rhetorician Bhāmaha appears to have written on prosody, as is clear from the citations associated with his name in the works of later writers. The *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira (587 A.D.) contains a chapter on prosody. The rules of metres along with ilustrations are contained in the *Chandoviciti* of Janāśraya (C. 800 A.D.). Kṣemendra's (C. 1050 A.D.) *Suvṛttatilaka* is a mine of information on this subject. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) is the author of the *Chandonuśāsana*. Kedārabhaṭṭa, who lived in the early part of the 15th century, was the first writer to give a systematic account of metres. His *Vṛttaratnākara* is the authoritative text on the subject. The *Prākṛtachandaḥsūtra*, dealing with the metres of the *Prākṛta* language, is wrongly attributed to Piṅgala. Its atuhor is not known and is assigned, on the strength of the contents, to the first quarter of the 15th century. Other works on this subject are the *Chandomañjarī* of Gaṅgādāsa of the 15th century, the *Vṛttaratnāvali* of Veṅkaṭeśa (C. 1550 A.D.), erroneously attributed to Kālidāsa, the *Vāṇībhūśaṇa* of Dāmodaramiśra of the same century, the *Nṛsiṁhavṛttamālā* of Virūpākṣayajvan of the 17th century and the *Vāgvallabha* of Duḥkhabhañjanakavi of uncertain date.

Among the classical metres, the following are well-known *Vasantatilaka*, *Mandākrāntā*, *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, *Śikhariṇī*, *Anuṣṭubh*, *Āryā* and *upajāti*.

LEXICOGRAPHY

Lexica represent the continuation of the *Nirukta* which gave the interpretation to the words of the *Vedas*. While the *Nirukta* deals with nouns and verbs, the lexica deal with nouns and indeclinables and occasionally with verbs. The list of such words is given in verse without arranging them in the alphabetical order as is done in modern dictionaries, as these verses had to be memorised. The words so selected are of two types viz., synonyms and homonyms. The words in the former are arranged according to subject-matter. Sometimes, they are arranged according to the final or initial consonant or the two combined or according to the number of letters in the word. Gender is indicated in some cases. The nouns are given in the nominative case. The lexica deals purely with homonyms while those on synonyms include a section on homonyms.

Kātyāyana's *Nāmamālā*, the lexicon by Vācaspati, that by Vikramāditya, one *Śabdārṇava*, *Saṁsārāvarta* and Vyādi's *Utpalinī* are held to be the earliest texts on the subject. All of them are lost to posterity. To Kālidāsa's authorship is attributed the *Nānārthaśabdaratna* on homonyms. It has a commentary named *Taralā* written by the poet Nicula at the instance of king Bhoja. The attribution of the former to Kālidāsa is not supported by any evidence. The identity of Nicula is not made out. The earliest authoritative text that is available is the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* of Amarasiṁha (C. 500 A.D.). This work which is well-known as the *Amarakośa* is synonymous in three sections called *Kāṇḍas* and has an appendix on homonyms, indeclinables and genders. To the same period belongs the *Anekārthasamuccaya* of Śāśvata.

In the eighth century, the Jain writer Dhanañjaya, the author of the *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya*, compiled two lexicons *Nāmamālā* and *Nighaṇṭusamaya*. During the same period, the *Liṅganuśāsana* was composed by Durgasiṁha. To the same period belongs the *Abhidhānanāmamālā* of unknown authorship and available only from the citations in later works. Halāyudha of the tenth century and the author of the *Kavirahasya* is the author of the *Abhidhānaratnamālā*. The Nāmamālikā is the composition of Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.), king of Dhārā. Yādavaprakāśa, the first teacher of Rāmānuja, the chief exponent of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* and later his pupil, is the author of the *Vaijayantī* on the homonyms and synonyms. The *Nānārtharatnamālā* on homonyms is ascribed to the authorship of Ajayapāla (1075-1140 A.D.).

In the beginning of the 12th century, Keśavasvāmin compiled the *Nānārthārṇavasaṁkṣepa* on homonymous words with meanings and genders. During the same period was written the *Viśvaprakāśa* on synonyms and homonyms by Maheśvara. About the same period, another Maheśvara prepared the *Śabdabhedaprakāśa* dealing with the spelling of words. Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) is the author of the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* also called *Nāmamālā* on synonyms, the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa*, a supplement to the former in the form of a botanic dictionary and the *Anekārthasaṅgraha* on homonyms of words from one syllable up to six. To the same period belongs the *Anekārthakośa* of Maṅkha, the author of the *Srīkaṇṭhacarita*. At about the same time, Śrīharṣa, the author of the *Nāiṣadhīyacarita*, compiled he *Dvirūpakośa* dealing with the words having three or more altertnative forms.

Puruṣottamadeva, a protege of the king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (C. 1170 A.D.), supplemented Amarasiṁha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* in the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*. About the same period, another Puruṣottamadeva a grammarian compiled the *Hārāvali* on synonyms and homonyms. Bhaṭṭamalla, who lived before the 14th century, is the author of the *Ākhyātacandrikā* on verbs having the same meaning. Mādhava, the minister of the Vijayanagar king Harihara II (1377-1404), compiled the *Ekākṣararatnamālā* giving various meanings for each alphabet. Irugappadaṇaḍnātha another minister of Harihara II is the author of the *Nānārtharatnamālā* on homonyms. The *Śabdacandrikā* and *Śabdaratnākara* are the works of Vāmana bhaṭṭabāṇa (C. 1420 A.D.). To the same period belongs the *Anekārthaśabdakośa* on homonyms by Medinikara. The *Nāmasaṅgrahamālā* dealing with synonyms is attributed to the authorship of Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.), the author of the *Kuvalayānanda*. About the same period, the *Kalpadru*, a synonymous lexicon was compiled by Keśavadaivajña. Besides these, there are lexica with the names *Ekākṣarakośa* dealing with words of one syllable, *Dvirūpakośa* with two syllables and so on.

Apart from these, there are dictionaries of unknown date dealing with the subjects like medicine, astronomy and astrology. The *Paiyālacchi* of Dhanapāla (C.1000 A.D.), the author of the *Tilakamañjarī*, is a dictionary of the *Prākṛta* words. Hemacandra's (1088-1172 A.D.) *Deśīnāmamālā* deals with words belonging to particular origin. In 1643 A.D., Vedāṅgarāya compiled the *Pārsīprakāśa* on astronomical and astrological terms. The *Uṇādikośa* of Mahādeva Vedāntin belongs to the same period. The *Pārsīprakāśa* is a dictionary of *Persian-Saṁskṛta* words. Encyclopaedic in contents are the lexica *Vācaspatya* of Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati and *Śabdakalpadruma* of Rādhākāntadeva, both of them being of recent origin.

CHAPTER XXVIII

JYAUTIṢA

This branch of science is allied to and derived from the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*. Astronomy, astrology and mathematics form the main divisions of this branch. The days were calculated and the constellations in conjunction with the planets were also observed. The Vedic-calendar was luni-solar in character. Equinoxes and solstices were observed. Eclipses are mentioned to have been produced by the shadow cast on the planet by the earth. From the early times, the movements of the celestial bodies and their influence on the life of human beings were recognised and studied. This was dealt with in a separate branch, viz. astrology which is connected with and dependent on astronomy which is mainly concerned with the movements of planets. Predictions of the future in men's life were also formulated. The services of an astrologer were considered indispensable for a king both in times of peace and war. Calculations of the movements of the planets and working out their positions laid the foundations of mathematics. India has the credit of having founded the system of algebraic symbols and the system of notation. Much progress was made in geometry and trigonometry. The works available on *Jyautiṣa* treat with all these divisions or some among them.

The early treatises in astronomy are available only in fragments. The *Gārgīsaṁhitā*, *Vṛddhagārgīsaṁhitā* (older than 3000 B.C.), fragments of the works of *Pauṣkarasādi*, the appendices of the *Atharvaveda* on constellations and the *Paitāmaha siddhānta* are some among the works of early writers. Varāhamihira who died in 587 A.D. mentions Asitadevala, Garga, Vṛddhagarga, Nārada and Parāśara as the early authorities whose works are available in fragmentary form. From the evidence of the Greek records on India, the *Gargasaṁhitā* and the *Vṛddhagargasaṁhitā* are known to have existed in the centuries which preceded the Christian era. That the principles of astronomy were well-known to Indians during this period is evident from some astronomical works and from the works on other subjects. The moon is a watery planet.[1] The rain-bow is formed by the reflection of the sun's rays on the cloud laden with water.[2] The positions and movements of the sun and moon were observed with accuracy. The nature of the ecliptic was rightly grasped. Those stars that lie on the path of the sun, and other planets and those which lie near the ecliptic were observed and studied in their positions. The law of gravitation was understood. Spheres (*golas*),

---

[1] *Kumārasambhava* V 22

[2] *Kumārsambbava* VIII 31

ghaṭikas and copper vessels resembling the lower half of a jar to measure time were the instruments used for observations.

From the *Pañcasiddhāntikā* of Varāhamihira, it is known that there were five schools of astronomy with the names *Paitāmaha*, *Romaka*, *Pauliśa*, *Sūrya* and *Vasiṣṭha*. The *Paitāmahasiddhānta* was luni-solar in treatment. The *Romakasiddhānta* dealt with the principles of astronomy founded by one Romaka. It did not adopt the Indian *Yuga* system but adopted its metonic period. It gave a meagre account of the eclipses. The meridian for the city of the Greeks was calculated. The tropical revolutions of the sun and the moon were calculated. Some scholars hold that this school refers to the astronomical principles of the Greeks. The *Pauliśasiddhānta* was accurate in treatment. It gave a rough account of the eclipses. The difference in longitudes between the city of the Yavanas and Ujjain was noted. It contained the tables of sines and dealt with spherical astronomy. Sidereal revolutions and anamolies in the movements of the planets were observed. The *Vāṣiṣṭha* school took note of the irregularities in the positions and movements of planets. The most accurate among these schools was that of *Sūrya*. It gave a general rule for the equation of the centre. It contained a full treatment of the eclipses.

The earliest known authority on Indian astromomy is Varāhamihira who died in 587 A.D. His *Pañcasiddhāntikā* gives an account of the above mentioned five astronomical schools. In order to train the minds of the pupils in astronomy, the *Śiṣyadhīvṛddhitantra* was written by Lalla about 748 A.D. and was commented by Bhāskara in the twelfth century. Āryabhaṭa (C.950 A.D.), is the author of the *Āryasiddhānta* and king Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) of the *Ādityapratāpasiddhānta*. The *Vidyāmādhavīya* of unknown authorship and written before 1350 A.D. gives a clear expositon of the schools of *Vaṣiṣṭha*, *Bṛhaspati*, *Gārgya* and others. Of uncertain date but definitely old is the *Vṛddhavāsiṣṭhasaṁhitā*. The *Jyotirvidābharaṇa* dealing with astronomical problems is definitely late in origin and is ascribed to Kālidāsa's authorship.

The earliest work on astrology is the *Yavanajātaka* which is preserved in a *Nepalese* manuscript. It is stated there that in the 91st year, one Yavaneśvara translated his own work into *Saṁskṛta* which came to be called *Yavanajātaka*. The date referred to here is of the *Śaka* era according to Bhaṭṭotpala (C.1000 A.D.). Hence the work must have been composed in 169 A.D. Another work with the same name containing four thousand *ślokas* was produced in the 191st year (268 A.D.) by one Sphūrjidhvaja. There are two other works with the same name of unknown date and authorship. One of these is called *Vṛddhayavanajātaka* which has eight thousand *ślokas*. Mīnarāja Yavanācārya is the author of the other work according to some scholars. As the title indicates, these *Yavanajātakas* deal with the astrological problems of Greek origin.

Varāhamihira divides the branch of *Jyautiṣa* into three parts, viz. *Tantra* dealing with astronomy and mathematics, *Horā* with horoscopes and *Saṁhitā* with astrology. His *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* containing 106 chapters reveals his acquaintance with and knowledge of the various fields of knowledge. Having dealt with the planets and constellations, their movements and their influences on man's life, he gives a brief account of Indian geography, signs of weather, the characterestic marks of men, women, animals and birds, and the meaning of omens and of marriage. He refers to the sunspots, their colours and the consequent effects of their appearance on the surface of the sun. He betrays his knowledge of the sciences of love and politics. Questions of marriage are discussed by him in the *Bṛhadvivāhaphala* and *Svalpavivāhaphala* bigger and smaller treatises on the subject. His *Yogayātrā* deals with the conduct of war. His *Bṛhajjātaka* and *Laghujātaka* are valuable works on astrology. In the former work, Varāhamihira refers frequently to the views of Yavanācārya and criticises them.

The *Horaṣaṭpañcāśikā* of Pṛthyuyaśas (C. 600 A.D.) son of Varāhamihira deals with nativities. The works of Varāhamihira and those of his son were commented by Bhaṭṭotpala (C. 1000 A.D.) who wrote also the *Horaśāstra*. Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) is the author of the Rājamārtaṇḍa and Vidvajjanavallabha. Among the manuals written after the eleventh century on marriages and ceremonies, the *Tājikas* are of importance. They betray Arabian and Persian influence. The most outstanding work of this type is the *Tājikā* of Nīlakaṇṭha written in 1587 A.D. Of uncertain date is the *Jyotiṣasāroddhāra* of Harṣakīrtisūri.

Palmistry is treated in the *Sāmudrikatilaka* which was begun in 1160 A.D. by Durlabharāja and completed by his son Jagaddeva who is credited with the authorship of the *Svapnacintāmaṇi* dealing with dreams. In 1176 A.D., Narahari wrote the *Narapatijayacaryāsvarodaya* on magic diagrams marked with mystic letters. The *Adbhutasāgara*, begun in 1168 A.D. by Ballālasena and completed by his son Lakṣmaṇasena king of Bengal, deals with omens and prognastications. The *Ramalarahasya* dealing with geomancy and the *Pācakakevali* with cubomancy are the works of Bhayabhañjana of uncertain date.

Astrological problems were dealt with by the writers in the *Prākṛta* language. The. *Aṅgavijjā* is one of the well-known works of this kind. It deals with prognostication on the basis of bodily signs. It is of unknown authorship and is placed in the fourth century A.D.

Kānajit, son of Prabhāśaṅkara, is the author of the *Vāyuśāstra*. He was a native of Bhujaṅgapura in Cutch. He gives the date of the work as 1822 Śaka era which corresponds to 1900 A.D. In ten chapters, the work deals with meteorological topics mainly concerned with rain. The effects and forecasts of untimely and sudden rain are dealt with in this work. According to the author, this work is based on the *Saṁhitās* of *Varāha*, *Kaśyapa*, *Bhadrabāhu* and *Vasiṣṭha* and *Parāśarasūtras*.

The treatment of mathematics denoted by the word *gaṇita* forms part of *Jyautiṣa*. Astronomy, arithmetic and algebra are dealt with under this head. It treats also with geometry, which had its beginnings in the *Sulvasūtras*. Perfection was attained by the Indian mathematicians in the terminology of enumeration up to *parārdha* (10^{14}). Precision is another feature which characterises Indian arithmetic. There are in the Vedic texts references to the principles involved in subtraction. The concept of number evolved by the Indian astronomers anticipates Western mathematical logic by several centuries. The numbers were treated as even and odd. The decimal scale of numeration owes its origin to the Indian mathematicians as also the algebraic symbols which were used to perfection in prosody and grammar. Constructions of rectilinear figures, mensuration of areas and volumes and the principles underlying the theorem of Pythagoras were all known to them. The principles of the theorem of Pythogoras are found applied in Bodhāyana's *Śrautasūtra* (500 B.C.) and the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*.

Āryabhaṭa born in 476 A.D. in Kusumapura was the earliest Indian astronomer to make use of his astronomical knowledge in mathematics. In 499 A.D., he wrote the *Āryabhaṭīya* containing ten stanzas on the general principles of mathematics. The *Daśagītikāsūtra* containing 108 stanzas, which is also a work of his, has thrity-three stanzas on mathematics, twenty-five on measurement and fifty on sphere. Āryabhaṭa held that the earth was a sphere and it rotated on its axis. His conception of the eclipses is the same as the one held by moderners. He dealt with evolution, involution, area, volume, circles, progressions and algebraic identities. The value of π given by him as 355/112 is far more accurate than 22/7 which is given by modern mathematicians. Bhāskara, the pupil of Āryabhaṭa, is the author of the *Laghubhāskarīya* and *Mahābhāskarīya*.

Brahmagupta who was born in 598 A.D. was an expert mathematician and wrote in 628 A.D., the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* which includes a chapter dealing with solutions for astronomical problems. In 665 A.D., he composed the *Khaṇḍakhādyaka* a work giving aids for astronomical calculations. The *Bakshali* manuscript, which is dated in the eighth century A.D., treats mathematics in the *sūtra* style. Haridatta, who lived before 869 A.D., is the author of the *Grahacāranibandhana* and *Grahacāranibandhanasaṁgraha*. The former written in the form of verse deals with astronomical calculations in accordance with the principles of a system called *Parahita*. The latter is a summary of the former in forty-five stanzas. The *Gaṇitasārasaṁgraha*, which was written at the beginning of the 10th century by Mahavīrācārya, is simpler than the work of Brahmagupta and deals with geometrical progressions. Śrīdhara's *Triśatī* written in 991 A.D. deals with quadratic equations. On surds (*karaṇa*) was written the *Rājamṛgāṅka* by Bhoja of Dhārā in 1042 A.D.

In 1172 A.D., Bhāskarācārya wrote the *Siddhāntaśiromaṇi* containing four parts viz, (1) *Līlāvatī* dealing with fractions and combinations, (2) *Bījagaṇita* with algebra (3) *Grahagaṇita* on astronomical calculations and (4) *Gola* on astronomical problems and astronomical instruments. In 1183 A.D, he wrote the *Karaṇakutūhala* on surds. On the same topic was written the *Bhāsvatī* by Śatānanda of unknown date. Nilakaṇṭhasomayājin, who was born in Kerala in 1442 A.D., is the author of the *Siddhāntadarpaṇa* which deals with topics in astronomy like epicycles, and astronomical constants, ecliptic, geocentric position of the planets, etc. Besides this, he is the author of nine other works on astronomy, some of them being the *Siddhāntadarpaṇavyākhyā*, a commentary on his own *Siddhāntadarpaṇa*, *Āryabhaṭīyabhāṣya*, a commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīya* of Āryabhaṭa and *Grahaṇanirṇaya* on the computation of lunar and solar eclipses.

Parameśvara of Kerala, who lived about the beginning of the 15th century, is the author of the *Goladīpikā* dealing with spherical astronomy. Besides this, he is the author of more than ten other works on astronomy and astrology. Some among these are commentaries on the *Āryabhaṭīya*, *Sūryasiddhānta*, *Līlāvatī* and others. Acyuta, who lived towards the end of the 16th century, hailed from Kerala and is the author of the *Rāśigolasphuṭānīti* which deals with the measurement of the longitudes of the planets and the stars along the ecliptic. He gives the formula for the reduction of the ecliptic. The *Karaṇottama* and *Uparāgakriyākrama* are some among his other works on astronomy. In 1643 A.D., Mālajit, who was awarded the title *Vedāṅgarāya* by his patron Shah Jehan, composed a work called *Pārsīprakāśa* which gives the methods by which the Hindu dates could be converted into Mahomedan dates.

In certain respects, Indian astronomy bears close resemblance to the Greek astronomy. The terms used to refer to the signs of the Zodiac are similar in both the systems. The parallax methods of calculations, study of the heliacal setting and rising of the luminaries, the correct measurement of days and nights, and the naming of the week days after the names of the planets are the instances that are strikingly similar to both the systems. The scholars of the West suggest the Greek origin and development for Indian astronomy. The features pointed out above to be similar to both the systems have been in vogue in India prior to 500 B.C. when Bodhāyana composed the *Dharmasūtras* which contain an account of these. A number of valuable treatises on astronomy, medicine and other subjects were taken away from India by the Greek scholars on their return to Greece along with Allexander about 323 B.C. Many of these treatises were rendered into *Greek*. The astronomical knowledge, as well as mathematical, of the Greeks became improved and therefore betray similar features to the Indian astronomy. The numerals and zero, invented in India, travelled to Arabia and having been taken from there to the countries in Europe were reintroduced into India by the English. The numerals came to be called by the wrong term Arabic numerals. The phenomenon of the equinoxes was first discovered in Greece in the second century B.C. by Hipparchus. This phenomenon known as *Ayana* was known to Indians several centuries before this date. This was first applied to the sun, moon and the planets and subsequently it came to be applied to the constellations as well. It must therefore be admitted that astronomy had its independent origin in India. Astronomy does not belong merely to the sphere of speculation. Its growth and development presuppose continued observation of planetary positions and accurate mathematical calculations of them.

CHAPTER XXIX

DHARMASAŚTRA

The word '*dharma*' is most comprehensive in its sense and connotation. In its primary sense, it means that which sustains the world. It connotes conduct, duty, law, religion, justice, morality and others. The *Mīmāṁsakas* take it in the sense of an act which produces a result called '*apūrva*, in the soul. The *Dharmaśāstras* use this in the sense of duties which are said to be five, viz., *varṇadharma*, *āśramadharma*, *varṇāśramadharma*, *naimittikadharma* and *guṇadharma*. These are based on the *Vedas*, *Smṛtii*, convention of those who know *dharma* and their conduct and personal satisfaction.[1] The *Dharmaśāstras* are called *Smṛtis*.

Vide :—श्रुतिस्तु वेदो विज्ञेयो धर्मशास्त्रं तु वै स्मृतिः ।।

Manusmṛti II 10

The word '*smṛti*' is derived thus स्मर्यते वेदधर्मोऽनेनेति

The *Dharmaśāstras* are based on the *Kalpasūtras* which contain in them the foundation of the rules of conduct and duty. They deal with duties religious and secular in nature. Their growth was assisted by the epics and *Purāṇas*. The *Mahābhārata* contains lengthy discourses on topics connected with conduct and duty. Passages from them and other sources were incorporated in the *Dharmaśastras*. The didactic element in them is due to this. Some of the texts contain the same passages, as they were taken from the same source. The question of borrowing by one from the other cannot be decided on account of this. Generally, these treatises are in the form of verse and prose, the latter form being used to discuss the topics in question.

Every *Dharmaśāstra* text deals with four aspects of *dharma*, viz. *ācāra* denoting the duties of people according to the individual qualification, *vyavahāra* legal and government practises, *prāyaścitta* expiatory and *karmaphala* based on the consequences of the acts already done. 'Law (*vyavāhara*) is an integral part of religion and ethics (*dharma*)'. Since the *Dharmaśāstras* mostly have been consulted in connection with litigation, debt, partition, adjudication, etc. they came to be called law-books. Hence the *Dharmaśāstras* which deal with *vyavahāra* are far more numerous than those dealing with each of the other three. Thus it can be said that to some extent, the *Dharmaśāstras* answer to the needs of the secular aspects of life.

The earlier treatises in this branch are the *Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Bodhāyana, Āpastamba, Vasiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Hārīta, Śaṅkha and Likhita,

---

[1] *Manusmṛti* II 1, 6

Vikhanas, Paiṭhīnasī, Uśanas, Kāśyapa and Bṛhaspati. The dates of these range from 600 B.C. to 400 A.D. The *Manusmṛti* or *Mānavadharmaśāstra* is the earliest available work which covers a wide sphere of topics beginning from creation and ending with a philosophical discourse of the *Vedānta* type. The text as it is available now has twelve chapters and is said to have been uttered by Bhṛgu. From this, it appears that Bhṛgu gave publicity to the utterances of Manu. Yāska's *Nirukta* and the *Mahābhārata* refer to Manu. The date of the work cannot be fixed. It travelled to Burma, Siam and Java and influenced the writing of law-books there on its model. The best known, among the commentaries on it, are by Medhātithi (825-900 A.D.) and Kullūkabhaṭṭa (C. 1200 A.D.).

Next in importance to the *Manusmṛti* is the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* which is placed between 100 B.C. and 300 A.D. It has three sections dealing with *ācāra*, *vyavahāra* and *prāyaścitta* respectively. It deals also with the *Vedānta* doctrines. Its popularity and authority are evident from the three commentaries that have gained unique reputation. It was commented by (1) Viśvarūpa (800-825 A.D.) in the *Bālakrīḍā*. (2) by Vijñāneśvara who wrote on it the *Mitākṣarā* in 1120 A.D. under the Cālukya Vikramāditya and (3) by Aparārka in the first half of the 12th century in the *Yājñavalkīyadharmaśāstranibandha*. Among these, the *Mitākṣarā* is treated as an independent treatise by itself on *vyavahāra*. It was commented by Bālambhaṭṭa also called as Bālakṛṣṇa, son of Pāyaguṇḍa Vaidyanātha, the grammarian of the 18th century. According to some scholars, Pāyaguṇḍa Vaidyanātha himself wrote the commentary. Since the commentary, which is known as *Bālaṁbhaṭṭi*, is also known as *Lakṣmīvyākhyāna*, it is held that the commentary must have been ascribed or dedicated to Lakṣmīdevī, wife of Pāyaguṇḍa Vaidyanātha. It lays great stress on the claims of women to property rights.

The *Nāradasmṛti* (100-300 A.D.) is available in a larger and a shorter version. Bāṇa (C. 650 A.D.), the prose writer, was aware of its existence. The *Parāśarasmṛti* is available in the shorter version, the longer one having been lost. The shorter version has a commentary by Mādhava (1297-1386 A.D.) of Vijayanagar known as *Parāśaramādhavīya*. The date of the original text is placed between 100 and 500 A.D. The *Bṛhaspatismṛti* (200-400 A.D.), which is available in fragments, can be taken as a criticism on the *Manusmṛti*. Besides these, there are a number of *Smṛti* texts whose number is given as 152.

In the whole range of *Dharmaśāstra* literature, the digests on law are of great value. They are numerous and highly authoritative. Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.), king of Dhārā, is the author of the *the Vyavahārasamuccaya* and *Cārucaryā*. Jīmūtavāhana wrote, in the 12th century A.D., a legal work called *Dharmaratna* having three parts named *Kālaviveka*, *Vyavahāramātṛkā* and *Dāyabhāga*. During the same period, Lakṣmīdhara composed the voluminous *Smṛtikalpataru* which is very popular. The *Brāhamaṇasarvasva* was written about

1160 A.D., by Halāyudha for king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal. About 1225 A.D., Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa composed the Smṛticandrikā. Varadarāja, who lived in the 13th century A.D., compiled a voluminous work named *Smṛtisaṅgraha* of which is available only a portion called *Vyavahāranirṇaya*. The *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* dealing with *vrata*, *dāna*, *tīrtha* and *mokṣa* together with an appendix was compiled by Hemādri about 1270 A.D. Its value is heightened on account of the large number of quotations contained in it. The religious duties and laws of succession were treated in the *Madanapārijāta* by Viśveśvara (C. 1400 A.D.). To the same period belong the *Smṛtiratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara and the *Kālamādhaviya* of Mādhava of Vijayanagar. To the next century belong a number of smaller treatises called *Cintāmaṇi* by Vācaspati. The *Sarasvatīvilāsa* of Pratāparudradeva of Utkala belongs to the 16th Century. During the same period were compiled by Raghunandana small treatises called *Tattvas* on ordeals and procedures and by Vaidyanāthadīkṣita the *Smṛtimuktāphala*. In the 17th century, Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita compiled the *Tithinirṇaya*, Kamalākarabhaṭṭa the *Nirṇayasindhu*, Nīlakaṇṭha the *Bhagavantabhāskara* and Mitramiśra the encyclopaedic *Vīramitrodaya*.

CHAPTER XXX

UPAVEDAS

ĀYURVEDA, GĀNDHARVAVEDA, DHANURVEDA, ARTHAŚĀSTRA AND ANCILLARY SCIENCES

In addition to the *Vedas* and their supplements, there are four *Upavedas* or secondary *Vedas*. They are *Āyurveda*, *Gāndharvaveda*, *Dhanurveda* and *Arthasāstra*. They represent the sciences of medicine, music, archery and politics respectively. The science of love is included under the *Āyurveda*. These command authenticity and authority next only to the *Vedas* in the respective subjects. Though most of them could be traced to human origin, they are called *Vedas* thereby showing that they are based on the fundamental principles of these branches visualised by seers steeped in the Vedic tradition. Hence what these teach are considered to be in consonance with the teachings of the *Vedas* and hence are as valid as the *Vedas* are.

ĀYURVEDA

The word '*āyurveda*' means that with which life is obtained. Whatever is the aim in life, health is the root cause for achieving it, as otherwise a man becomes a prey to diseases and does not get the aim of life fulfilled.

Vide :—धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाणामारोग्यं मूलमुत्तमम् ।
रोगास्तस्यापहर्तारः श्रेयसो जीवितस्य च ॥

Carakasaṁhitā-Sūtrasthāna I. 14

The aim of the system of medicine lies not merely in curing the diseases but to maintain the health of the individuals in order that they would not get affected by diseases.

Vide :—आयुर्वेदप्रयोजनं व्याध्युपसृष्टानां व्याधिपरिमोक्षः,
स्वस्थस्य स्वास्थ्यस्य रक्षणञ्च ।

Suśrutasaṁhitā-Sūtrasthāna I

The origin of this *Veda* is to be traced to the *Atharvaveda* and other allied texts which contain references to embryology, hygiene and anatomy. Rudra's blessings are invoked for remedies from ailments.[1] Grace of God is primarly responsible in warding off diseases and human efforts in applying medicinal remedies come only next. The fundamental principles of science formulated by the *Vaiśeṣika* and *Sāṅkhya* were incorporated into the system of *Āyurveda* for studying the constitution of the human body and for making medicinal preparations from matter consisting of plants, herbs and others. Though primarily the medical appliances are to afford relief to the body, it is the soul that must derive benefit ultimately. Therefore religion, philosophy and science played a prominent part in the growth and development of the *Āyurveda*. On this ground, the system shall not be described as unscientific. Even in science, direct observations have their own limitations. The use of terms like ultra-microscopic proves this. Scientific method includes verification and formulations of conclusions controlled by rigid reasoning. The *Āyurveda* system also must have gone through this process but was guided primarily by the infallible authority of the sayings of the wise, as all other approaches lead to no finality in discovering truth.

---

[1] *Ṛigveda* II-33. 2, 4, 13

The development of the *Āyurveda* is closely connected with the *Dharmaśāstras* which prescribe the rules of conduct. These rules have a bearing on the principles of hygiene. The restrictions on the nature of food as prescribed in them are indispensable for the maintenance of good health. Food is to be taken not for the mere appeasement of hunger or merely for the growth of the physical organism. It must be conducive also to the gradual improvement of *sattva* which alone would make a man. Therefore the *Āyurveda* system deals with the principles of hygiene, conduct and ethical codes.

The *Āyurveda* system deals with life in all its phases physiological, biological and psychological. It includes in its treatment the preventive and curative sides of medicine and surgery. The three qualities of matter *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas* are closely connected with the three humours *Kapha*, *Vāta* and *Pitta* and influence them. *Kapha* stands for the function of "cooling and preservation and production of various fluids" e.g., mucus. *Vāta* or *Vāyu* refers to 'all phenomenon of motion which come under the functions of cell-life.' *Pitta* represents 'the function of metabolism and heatproduction', process of digestion, colouration of blood, etc. Diseases are classified as physical and mental. They are caused by the derangement of these humours. While preparing remedies for ailment, great care is taken to understand this. The effect of the seasons on the health of the person is also studied before prescribing remedies. Treatments are divided into hot and cold. The circulation of blood is studied with fair clearness. Surgery was practised including major operations like amputation, laporotomy and trephining of the skull. The early texts contain descriptions of surgical instruments. Embryology was studied and practised.[1] Consumption is treated in detail. The *Āyurveda* has eight sections, viz. 1. *Śalya*, surgery and midwifery; 2. *Sālākya*, dealing with the diseases of the head and the organs there 3. *Kāyacikitsā*, science and art of medicine; 4. *Bhūtavidyā*, psycho-therapy,

---

[1] *Rāmāyaṇa-Sundarakāṇḍa* 28-6.

5. *Kaumārabhṛtya* treatment of children; 6. *Agadatantra*, toxicology; 7. *Rasāyanatantra*, on elixirs and 8. *Vājīkaraṇatantra* on rejuvenation. The study of the *Āyurveda* is made in eight sections, viz. *Sūtra*, *Śārītra*, *Indriya*, *Cikitsā*, *Nidāna*, *Vimāna*, *Vikalpa* and *Siddhi*.

The texts on *Āyurveda* that are now available are based on the teachings of Brahmā, Aśvin, Dhanvantari, Indra, Bharadvāja, Ātreya, Agniveśya, Kāśyapa, Hārita and Bhela. Some among these are said to have written a text on *Āyurveda* and thus are associated with the origin of a school named after them. Among them, Punarvasu Ātreya is known, from the Buddhist records, to have lived at Taxila before the birth of Gautama Buddha, *i.e.* before 600 B.C. He taught the system of medicine to Agniveśa who in his turn taught it to Caraka. Caraka and one Dhṛḍhabala put what they were taught in the form of a treatise called *Carakasaṁhitā*. This is the earliest text now available and hence is the oldest authoritative text on medicine. Indian tradition identifies him with the grammarian Patañjali (150 B.C.).[1] The Buddhists' *Piṭakas* make him a physician in the court of Kaniṣka (100 A.D.) which evidence helps the Western scholars in assigning Caraka to the first century A.D. Dṛḍhabala, who is quoted by Vāgbhaṭa in the 6th century A.D., is taken to have lived in the 4th century A.D. and therefore could not have been a contemporary of Caraka. It is said that he added his own materials and recast the work of Caraka.

The *Carakasaṁhitā*, which is attributed to the authorship of Caraka, has eight sections and thirty chapters. The eight sections are : 1. *Sūtrasthāna* on remedies, diet and duties of a doctor; 2. *Nidānasthāna* on the main diseases, 3. *Vimānasthāṇa* on pathology, medical studies and duties of a medical student, 4. *Śārīrasthāna* on anatomy and embryology, 5. *Indryasthāna* on diagonosis and prognosis ; 6. *Cikitsāsthāna* on special therapy; 7. and 8. *Kalpasthāna* and *Siddhi* on general therapy. It was rendered into *Arabic* about 800 A.D. and into *Persian* even earlier. It is written in the form of prose and verse. Some of the many noteworthy points in regard to the contents of this work are the references to various forms of insanity such as epilepsy (*apasmāra*), dementia (*atattvābhiniveśa*) and others. The causes and nature of the epidemics are analysed. Why and how infectious diseases spread are explained. Caraka mentions about the worms and germs moving in blood-vessels.

Suśruta is the author of the *Suśrutasaṁhitā* a valuable treatise on the *Āyurveda* laying stress on surgery. He speaks of surgical instruments and surgical operations. His date cannot be ascertained with definiteness. He must have been a very early writer, perhaps a contemporary of Caraka. While discussing skin diseases, he points out that some diseases are infectious through skin, respiratory, alimentary and other tracts. He prescribes fresh liver in cases of anaemia and testicular extract in cases of impotency. He deals with matters connected with abnormal labour and cataract.

---

[1] Bhoja's *Rājamārtāṇḍa* on *Yogasūtra* I. 1

The *Kāśyapasaṁhitā* deals with the diseases of children and those connected with pregnancy. The date of the work cannot be ascertained. There is another *Kāśyapasaṁhitā*, one of the 108 *Pāñcarātrasaṁhitās*, dealing with the nature of serpents, their poisons and their cures. The *Bhela* (*Bheda*) *saṁhitā* is available in a single manuscript and is defective in form. The *Nāvanītaka* or Bower Manuscripts discovered in 1890 A.D., contains valuable information on powders, oils, elixirs and others. It is supposed to be the cream of all other earlier texts. The date of this is fixed in the 4th century A.D. On *Kaumārabhṛtya* is available the *Vṛddhajīvakiyā* by *Vṛddhajīvaka* in a fragmentary form.

In the 6th century A.D., Vāgbhaṭa, son of Siṁhagupta and grandson of Vāgbhaṭa, wrote the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya* and *Aṣṭāṅgasaṁgraha*. Vāgbhaṭa is considered by the Western scholars to have been a Buddhist but the Hindu principles of life which colour the two works prove him to be a Hindu. The older Vāgbhaṭa is said to have been the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṁgraha* and his grandson the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*. There is no evidence to support this contention. The *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, which is based on the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṁgraha*, is also called *Aṣṭṅāgahṛdayasaṁhitā*. Subsequent to its writing, it has been enjoying unique popularity.

To one Nāgārjuna is attributed the authorship of the *Yogasāra* and *Yogaśāstra*. He is identified by some critics with the Buddhist philosopher Nāgārjuna who is said to have flourished in the court of Kaniṣka (100 A.D.). The *Rugviniścaya* of Mādhavakara of the 8th century deals with pathology. The prescriptions for curing diseases were given by Vṛnda of uncertain date in the *Siddhiyoga* which is also called *Vṛndamādhava*. The *Haramekhalā* is a *Prākṛta* work on medicine and perfumery by Māhuka (900 A.D.). Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) of Dhārā is the author of the *Rājamṛgāṅka*, *Āyurvedasarvasva* and *Viśrāntavidyāvinoda*. Vṛnda's influence is felt in the *Cikitsāsāra* on therapeutics written about 1060 A.D. by Cakrapāṇidatta. Another work with the same name was written during the same time by Vaṅgasena. The same subject was treated by Milhaṇa in the *Cikitsāmṛta* about the year 1224 A.D. In the 13th century, Vopadeva, the founder of a school of grammar known after his name, commented on the *Śārṅgadharasaṁhitā* an original and ancient work on medicine. To his authorship is attributed a work called *Sataślokī* dealing with powders and pills. Equally valuable are the *Cikitsākalikā* of Tisaṭa of the 14th century, *Bhāvaprakāśa* of Bhāvamiśra of the 16th century and *Vaidyajīvana* of Lolambaraja of the 17th century.

Importance was given in the *Ayurveda* to the metallic preparations and to quick-silver among the metals. Quick-silver was used to transmute base metals. It was also used to prepare elixirs. Nāgārjuna the Bhddhist philosopher (C. 100 A.D.) is said to be the author of the *Rasaratnākara* dealing with alchemy. The *Rasaratnasamuccaya*, whose date is fixed in 1300 A.D., is attributed to Vāgbhaṭa. Aśvinīkumāra or Neminātha is also credited with its authorship. The last mentioned writer is the author also of another work named *Rasaratnākara*. The importance given to quicksilver resulted in the rise of a system of thought called *Raseśvarasiddhānta* which is treated in the *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha* of Mādhavācārya of 13th century. Śiva and Pārvatī are the deities of the system. *Rasārṇava*, *Rasahṛdaya* and other works deal with this subject.

There are medical treatises for curing the diseases of animals, trees and others. Surapāla's *Vṛkṣāyurveda* treats the diseases of plants. The diseases of the elephants are dealt with in Nārāyaṇa's *Mātaṅgalīlā* and Pālakāpya's *Gajavaidya*. The diseases of the horses are treated in the *Aśvāyurveda* of Gaṇa, *Aśvavaidyaka* of Jayadatta and Dīpaṅkara, *Yogamañjarī* of Vardhamāna, *Aśvacikitsā* of Nakula, *Aśvāyurveda* of Vāgbhaṭa (C. 1000 A.D.), *Śālihotra* of Bhoja of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.) and the *Aśvaśāstra* of Sukhānanda.

There are lexicons on the subject of medicine. They are the *Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu* of uncertain date, Sureśvara's (1075 A.D.) *Śabdapradīpa*, Narahari's (1235-1250 A.D.) *Rājanighaṇṭu*, Madanapāla's (1374 A.D.) *Madanavinodanighaṇṭu* on *materia medica* and Pathyāpathyanighaṇṭu of unknown authorship on dietectics.

The Western scholars attempted in vain to trace the origin of Indian medicine in Greek medicine. There are numerous instances to show that the system of Indian medicine influenced the Arabians and the Persians and through them the Greeks. When Alexander (323 B.C.) invaded India, his men suffered from snake-bite in the Punjab. Finding his physicians unable to cure them, he sought the aid of Indian physicians whose treatment won his admiration. This must have induced him to take along with him some eminent Indian physicians whose services would have helped the Greeks to improve their system of medicine. Besides, the Indian theory of *Kapha*, *Vāta* and *Pitta* differs from the humoral theory of the Greeks.

KĀMAŚĀSTRA

The science of love is included under the *Vājīkaraṇa* section of of the *Āyurveda*. The purpose for doing so is to show that love is not the goal in life and that excessive indulgence in the sensual pleasures would lead a man to utter ruin from which there is no recovery. The aim of this science is therefore to warn the lascivious against the dangers attendant on pursuing a lustful life. The earliest treatise on this science is the *Kāmasūtra* by Vātsyāyana Mallanāga who was a physician. The various aspects of love are dealt with candidly in the five chapters of this work. Happiness in life is available through marriage. Indulgence in love shall not be at the risk of *Dharma* and *Artha*. This work is assigned to the 2nd century A.D. Vātsyāyana mentions Bābhravya, Cārāyaṇa, Gonardīya and others as the earlier exponents of this science. Some of these are mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. The sūtras of Dattaka, a predecessor to Vātsyāyana, are lost. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana was commented in the *Jayamaṅgala* by Yaśodhara (1243-1261 A.D.). Other works on the subject are the *Pañcasāyaka* of Jyotirīśvara who lived after the 11th century A.D., the *Ratirahasya* of Kokkoka written before 1200 A.D., the *Ratimañjarī* of Jayadeva of uncertain date, the *Ratiratnapradīpikā* of Immaḍi Prauḍhadevarāya (1422-1448 A.D.), king of Vijayanagar, the *Anaṅgaraṅga* of Kalyāṇamalla of the 16th century and the *Kandarpacintāmaṇi* of Vīrabhadra of the same century.

GĀNDHARVA VEDA

The *Gāndharvaveda* is a secondary *Veda* and is connected with the *Sāmaveda*. It includes dancing and music. The Vedic accent was responsible for the development of the *svaras* in Indian music. The Purāṇas contain accounts of music and dancing. Sadāśiva, Brahmā and Bharata are the earliest authorities on dancing. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* laid the foundations of dancing and music. The very title *Nāṭyaśāstra* shows the importance given in it to dramatic gestures which have music as their ancillary. From the quotations in the works of later writers, it appears that there were two authorities having the names Vṛddhabharata and Bharata. The former wrote a *Nāṭyavedāgama* otherwise called *Dvādaśasāhasrī* which is available only in quotations. The latter wrote the *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is called *Śatasāhasrī.* While dealing with these gestures in detail, Bharata treats sentiment and dramatic action. Hence the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is treated as an authority on music, dancing, drama and rhetoric. Bharata's pupil Dattila wrote the *Dattila* on music and dancing which is now lost. Nandikeśvara or Nandin is said to have composed the *Bharatārṇava* in four thousand *ślokas* on music and dancing. He was probably a contemporary of Bharata. The available portions of this work are the *Nāṭyārṇava* and *Abhinayadarpaṇa* dealing with the art of dance. Rāmacandra, pupil of the Jain Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.), composed, along with one Guṇacandra, the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* with a commentary on it.

Melody is given importance in India music. To add to its charm every phase of music was developed to perfection. A careful and critical study of sound in all its varieties was made. The audible sound is called *śruti*. Twenty-two varieties in *śruti* are recognised by the exponents of music. The *śruti* produces the *svara* which the smooth and resonant sound and which pleases the listener by itself.

Vide :—श्रुत्यनन्तरभावी यः स्निग्धोऽनुरणनात्मकः ।
स्वतों रञ्जयति श्रोतृच्चित्तं स स्वर उच्यते ।।
Saṅgītaratnākara I-3-24, 25

The musical modes (*rāgas*) are produced out of the *svaras* which are grouped together in a manner to produce the progression of notes according to accepted laws of melody. Great stress is laid on the place of *gamaka* in music which is produced, by the graceful polish or trill given to the *svaras*.

Vide :—स्वरस्य कम्पो गमकः श्रोतृचित्तसुखावहः ।

Saṅgītaratnākara II 3-87

Strict attention is paid to execution and accuracy in music which is set in a religious background. Music is two fold, viz., vocal and instrumental. The flute, lute or *Vīṇā* with many strings and the drums are the musical instruments. Music is classified as *mārga* which accords with the rules of the system and as *deśī* which belongs to different places or regions.

The *Yamalāṣṭakatantras* deal with music to some extent. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the earliest authoritative text on music. Kohala, the pupil of Bharata, is said to have written a work on music of which only the *Tālādhyāya* is now available. Mataṅga, who lived before the 4th century B.C., wrote the *Bṛhaddeśī* on the *deśī* type. This work is available in fragments. His views on music are quoted by Abhinavagupta and others. The *Saṅgītamakaranda*, which is attributed to the authorship of Nārada, refers to the view held by Abhinavagupta and so is assigned to a period subsequent to 850 A.D. Someśvara, the son of Cālukya Vikramāditya VI, wrote in 1131 A.D., the *Mānasollāsa* which deals with music and musical instruments. In 1180 A.D., Nānyadeva composed the *Sarasvatīhṛdayālaṅkārahāra* in seventeen chapters on the rules for the *ragas*.

Śārṅgadeva, who styles himself as Niśśaṅka, is the author of the *Saṅgītaratnākara* a treatise on music in seven chapters. He was the son of Soḍhala, a poet in the court of king Siṅghaṇa of the Yādava dynasty, who ruled at Devagiri from 1210 to 1247 A.D. Śārṅgadeva's date may be placed about 1260 A.D. The *Saṅgītaratnākara* is an original treatise containing the definitions and illustrations together with discussions on them. Śārṅgadeva's erudition in music, philosophy and medicine is clearly revealed in this work. The *Saṅgītasamayasāra* is the work of the *Jain* Pārśvadeva of the 13th century. The *Saṅgītasudhākara* of Haripāla and the *Saṅgītasāra* of Vidyāraṇya identified with Mādhava of Vijayanagar belong to the 14th century. The Reddi prince Vemabhūpāla (C. 1420 A.D.) is the author of the *Saṅgītacintāmaṇi*. In 1440 A.D., was written the *Saṅgītarāja* by king Kumbhakarṇa of Mewar. The *Svaramelakalānidhi* which was written by Rāmāmātya in the middle of the 16th century deals with the *ragas* of Karnatic music.

The North Indian music was enriched by the contribution of Puṇḍarīka Viṭṭhala (C.1600) through his works *Nartananirṇaya*, *Rāgamañjarī*, *Rāgamālā* and *Saḍrāgacandrikā*. About the same period, the *Saṅgītasudhā* was written by Govindadīkṣita for king Raghunātha

Nāyak of Tanjore. Other works written in the same century are the *Rāgavibodha* of Somanātha written in 1609 A.D., the *Saṅgītadarpaṇa* of Caturadāmodara, the *Caturdaṇḍiprakāśikā* of Veṅkaṭamakhin son of Govindadīkṣita, the *Saṅgītasārasaṅgraha* of Jagjjyotirmalla king of Nepal (1617-1633 A.D.) the author of the drama *Haragaurīvivāha*, the *Saṅgītapārijāta* of Ahobila and the *Saṅgītadāmodara* of Śubhaṅkara. Bālarāmavarman, king of Travancore (1753-1798 A.D), is the author of the *Bālarāmabharata* on music and dancing.

DHANUR VEDA

The science of archery *Dhanurveda* is treated as one of the secondary *Vedas*. Viśvāmitra is said to have composed a treatise on this which is not now available. It is believed to have been divided into four parts, viz., *dīkṣā* training, *saṁgraha* receiving the weapons, *siddhi* attainment of skill in the use of them, and *prayoga* their employment. The treatises which are believed to have been composed by Vikramāditya, Sadāśiva and Śārṅgadatta on this science are not also available. The *Kodaṇḍamaṇḍana* is also a treatise on archery. The *Vīra cintāmaṇi* of Śārṅgadhara (1363 A.D.) deals with topics of fighting.

ARTHA ŚĀSTRA

Politics is designated as *Arthaśāstra* which deals with the second pursuit of life. From the very early times, *Arthaśāstra* and *Dharmaśāstra* became allied to each other. The main basis for this alliance has been the conception of *trivarga-dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*. The result of this ideal in the case of *Arthaśastra* has led to the inclusion herein of the topics specially dealt with in the *Dharmaśāstras*. The same may be said of the *Dharmaśāstras*. This system is denoted by the terms *Daṇḍanīti*, *Rājanīti* and *Nītiśāstra*, which convey the same sense with slight variations in their connotations. The aims and purposes served by the *Arthasāstra* are the acquisition of advantages, not already acquired, to preservation of what has been acquired, increasing that and distributing that among deserving recipients.[1]

The principles of the *Arthaśāstra* are found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. The system is related to the *Atharvaveda*. The beginnings of this system are to be traced to the didactic verses in the *Mahābhārata*, *Dharmaśāstra* and other texts. Indra and Bṛhasptati are considered to be the authorites on this subject. The former is said to have written a treatise *Bāhudantaka* on politics which is now lost.

The earliest available treatise is the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya also known as Cāṇakya and Viṣṇugupta, who was the minister of Maurya Candragupta. The date of the work is placed in the period about

---

1. *Arthaśāśtra* p. 9

320 B.C. The work is divided into fifteen sections each having sub-divisions. Each sub-division is written in prose with a verse at the end summarising the contents in that division. There are also found *sūtras* which are commented by the author who tells that he was forced to comment in order to avoid misinterpretations.[1] He places the *Arthaśāstra* within *Itihāsa* and treats it as holding a place along with the *Vedas*, philosophy and others.

Vide :—आन्वीक्षिकी त्रयी वार्ता दण्डनीतिश्चेति विद्याः ।

Arthaśāstra p. 6

Kauṭilya refers to some political schools like Mānava, Pārāśara, Bārhaspatya and others and to individual authorities such as Kātyāyana, Bharadvāja, Viśālākṣa, Parāśara and others. He deals with various topics connected with the administration of the state. Some among them are the training to be given to the princes, the council of ministers, work of the spies and ambassadors, control of administration, law, offence, penalty, inflation, taxation, the six expedients of the state policy, vices of kings, priests, bards, magic devices and so on. The existing state must be provided with security. The king is no more than a servant of the state. He condemns fatalism. His work "is characterised by a freshness and realism which suggest that the author had first-hand experience of the actual problems of which he so engagingly writes."[2]

The science of politics is treated in the *Sukranītisāra* in 2200 *ślokas* which is said to be a condensed version of a bigger work. It can be placed about the second century B.C. The *Nītisāra* Kāmandaka is based on Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* whose author Viṣṇugupta it mentions. It has a number of didactic verses. It shall be placed before the 7th century A.D., as it is known to Vāmana (C. 800 A.D.), the author of the *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtras*. Somadevasūri, who is identified by some scholars with the author of the *Yaśāstilaka*, is the author of the *Nītivākyāmṛta*. Being a Jain, the author does not agree with Kauṭilya's treatment of administration and war. Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) of Dhārā is the author of the *Cāṇakyanīti*, *Putramārtāṇḍa* and *Yuktikalpataru*. The *Laghvarhannīti* of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.) is based on the *Jain* principles governing administration. Other works on this subject are *Nītiratnākara* of Caṇḍeśvara, *Nītiprakāśikā* and others.

ANCILLARY SCIENCES

The *Śilpaśāstra* or *Vāstuvidyā*, which represents the branch of architecture, has been a very highly developed system from early times. The *Buddhists* and the *Jains* have contributed much to its development. Religion and utilitarianism have been its main features. The huge temples of South India, *stūpas*, *vihāras*, *caityas* and others found at Sarnath, Sanchi, Ajanta and other places reflect the intellectual and moral culture of the master-builders of ancient India. Town-planning formed part of this branch. 'Scientific exactness, remarkable commonsense and references to the sanitary requirements and to the military needs of the community' were the noteworthy features of the system of architecture which are revealed in the texts representing this branch. The *Mayamata*, *Sanatkumāravāstuśāstra*, *Śilparatna* of Śrīkumāra of the 16th century A.D., and the *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* of Bhoja of Dhārā (1040 A.D.) are the treatises on architecture. The *Mānasāra*, which deals with architecture and sculpture, treats everything that is built according to a design and with an artistic finish. Maṇḍana, an architect in the service of king Kumbhakarṇa, (1419-1469 A.D.), is the author of the *Vāstumaṇḍana* and *Prāsādamaṇḍana*.

---

[1] *Arthaśāstra* p. 429

[2] C.E.M. Joad : History of Indian Civilisation p. 88

Painting as an art reached perfection at the hands of ancient Indians. The frescoes of Ajanta bear testimony to this. Indian painting and sculpture avoid the crude realism of bones and muscles and concentrate on spiritual expression. The purpose of music, dancing, painting and architecture is to represent the glory of God which defies comprehension and expression in words. 'Art, in fact, is the window through which men may gaze upon reality.'[1] The pictures, which are painted, are divided as *viddha* and *aviddha*. The former shows the accurate drawing while the latter gives an idea of the original without reference to the degree of accuracy. The *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* deals with this topic. References to these types are found in the *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* of Someśvara, son of Cālukya Vikramāditya VI (C. 1200 A.D.) and the *Tilakamañjarī* of Dhanapāla (C.1000 A.D.). The *Pañcadaśī* of Vidyāraṇya (C. 1350 A.D.), which dealt with painting, is not now available.

The use of the gems gave rise to the growth of the branch *Ratnaśāstra* of which there is some account included in the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā* of Varāhamihira. The texts available on this subject are the *Agastimata*, *Ratnaparīkṣā* of Buddhabhaṭṭa, *Navaratnaparīkṣā* of Nārāyaṇa, *Ratnadīpikā* of Caṇḍesvara (C. 1300 A.D.), and others.

Stealing also was considered an art. Karṇīsuta and Mūladeva are mentioned as the authorities in this art. The dramas *Mṛcchakaṭika* and *Mattavilāsaprahasana* contain some references to the art of theft. The latter work mentions Karpaṭa as the author of a manual for thieves Skanda, the son of Śiva, is mentioned in the former, as the authority and god for thieves. Kanakaśakti and Bhāskaranandin are the authorities cited. Details about the mode of effecting the breaches, selection of sites for this and others are contained in this drama. All the works, supposed to have been written by the above mentioned writers, are lost. The only available work on the subject is *Saṇmukhakalpa*.

---

[1] C.E.M. Joad : History of Indian Civilisation p. 63

The *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* of Bhoja of Dhārā (1005-1054 A.D.) is unique on account of the valuable information it contains on the various kinds of machines. The various mechanisms are given about the construction of certain machines like the elephant-machine, door-keeper machine, solder-machine etc. There is special mention of the wooden bird machine travelling through the sky and the *vimāna* flying in the air. The *vimānas* have mercury vapour as the fluid and are worked. The author tells he does not give the methods lest they should lead to difficulties or danger at the hands of those who are not initiated in the task. The *Agastyasaṁhitā*, *Vimānacandrikā* of Nārāyaṇa, *Vyomayānatantra* of Śaunaka, *Yantrakalpa* of Garga, *Yānabindu* of Vācaspati, *Kheṭayānapradīpikā* of Cāndrayaṇī and *Vyomayānārkaprakāśa* of Dhuṇḍinātha are the authoritative works on aeronautics. All of them are lost now. The works that are said to be extant are the *Vaimānikaśāstra* of Bharadvāja and *Yantrasarvasva* of Bharadvāja, probably different from the former.

A separate branch of study under the name botany does not appear to have been in existence in ancient literature. References to the plants and trees, their growth and development under changed conditions and other aspects concerned with them are available in the *Vṛkṣāyurveda*, *Agnipurāṇa*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, *Suśrutasaṁhitā* and Śaṅkaramiśra's commentary of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras*.. There is a *Vṛkṣāyurveda* by Vāghbaṭa. Śārṅgadhara of the 13th century is the author of the *Upavanavinoda* on plants in all their respects.

The name of one Nāgārjuna is connected with the development of the branch of chemistry. He is considered to have been an early authority on medicine and chemistry. His contribution to metallic preparations of compounds particularly of mercury and iron is mentioned by the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Thsang (629-645 A.D.) and the Muslim scholar Alberuni (1017-1030 A.D.). Drugs prepared out of arsenic were used internally. Suśruta discusses the preparation and use of alkalies and alkaline caustics. The Kutub pillar, which is still free from rust with the words inscribed on it clear even after fourteen centuries, reveals the methods of manufacturing steel and using it for definite purposes. The *Rasārṇava* and *Rasaratnasamuccaya* give methods for the extraction of zinc from ores. The Buddhists had made a good contribution to the branch of chemistry.

The experience of the ancient Indians in the fields of medicine including surgery and astronomy is evident from the works of the respective branches of study. This presupposes accurate knowledge of the science of plants and herbs., of the properties of matter and of the stars and planets. This knowledge was not confined to the theoretical aspect only. Experiments should have been conducted in the workshops in the matters relating to these sciences. The nature of the experiments conducted, the apparatus used for the purpose and other matters were not handed down to posterity. The reasons for this could be easily found out. The doctine of *ahiṁsā*, which was given over-emphasis by the Buddhistic and Jain preachers, was mainly responsible for the disappearance of the surgical side of Indian medicine. The migration of the Buddhists to China and Tibet with their valuable records in chemistry led to the decline of chemistry as an applied science. The Muslim invasion attended by iconoclasm and destruction of the valuable treasures of knowledge Hindu in nature and form resulted in the helpless people fleeing to places of safety leaving behind what they cherished dear. In course of time, the people were cut off from traditional arts and sciences. Lastly, valuable works on these applied sciences were lost to us having been taken away by the foreigners.

CHAPTER XXXI

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The term 'philosophy' means love of wisdom. It denotes the desire to acquire wisdom or knowledge. This knowledge is about the world in relation to the spirit. While attempting to acquire this knowledge, logical arguments are employed thus showing the speculative nature of philosophy. The term 'religion' denotes a faith or belief which is put to practise. The faith is about the individual selves and God and their mutual relation. God's supremacy over the selves and matter is admitted. Religion thus becomes a matter of experience. It is a sort of spiritual discovery in which God, defying the reach of intellect, becomes the object of human experience. This becomes clear when the real sense of the word 'religion' made up of religion meaning binding again or coming together again is taken into consideration. In other words, religion is that which brings God and self together again, since self was originally with God and has been separate due to ignorance. The experience which the self gets is vivid, direct, fresh and thrilling. Thus religion is practical and receptive.

Philosophy and religion, which are kept separate in the Western countries because of their distinctive traits, are treated in India as a composite whole with no line of demarcation drawn between them. In India, the speculative work of philosophy does not stop with the search after truth. It prescribes a way of life consistent with the search it makes and thus merges into the realm of religion. The goal in life is therefore the attainment of the reality which is established by philosophy. This inter-relation between philosophy and religion is maintained because of the faith of the Indians which treats the world as spiritual with both matter and spirit being present there and which finds a unity amidst diversity. The ultimate therefore is only one, though the approaches leading to it are different. These approaches differ between each other, as truth is viewed from different angles. Thus not only are the religions different from each other but the philosophical conceptions of the ultimate truth also are different. This enabled the growth in this land of the different systems of thought and faith and development of them side by side.

The conduct of man as laid down in the *Dharmasāstras* is based on the principles of religion evolved by speculation. Order and regularity of conduct were expected to be observed by those who practise it. The evolution of the caste system, orders in life (*āśrama*) and the four-fold aims in life have been responsible for achieving the purpose of religious life. The law of transmigration, which was evolved after a deep study of the causes and effects of worldly life, has been the main support for leading an ethical life. Besides revealing that every individual is the architect of his own fate thus giving an explanation to the present status of an individual, it gives utter freedom to the individual either to better his future by leading a moral life or to suffer again owing to carelessness and negligence. Hence Indian philosophy cannot be condemned as pessimistic. The doctrine of salvation is a necessary corollary. The right course leading to salvation is made known by philosophical speculation but it is ethical life that prevents the knowledge of this course from getting obscured by ignorance and wrong action. Salvation is therefore obtainable by work and not by mere faith. Religion is given more importance than mere philosophical speculation.

The Vedic texts contain the germs which sprouted and grew up into the systems of philosophy. The purpose of these systems is to prove the existence of the Supreme Being. In some of these systems, the ideal is to get rid of the worldly sufferings. Speculations regarding these began at a very early stage. While the *Brāhmaṇa* portions of the *Vedas* help the development of an ethical and religious life, the *Upaniṣads* make speculations proceed on right lines. The *Upanisads* however contain many doctrines each of which is developed ater in a unified and connected way.

Each system of thought expects, from a student wishing to study that system, a healthy belief in the old texts on which it is based and in the conclusions arrived at by the pioneers who built that system. In this respect, the development of the system of thought may be compared to the blossoming of a flower which is gradual and in which the petals do not get dissociated from the flower but remain intact with it.

The systems of thought are varied according to the mode of speculation adopted. Each system is called '*darśana*' which means spiritual perception of that which helps in the acquisition of knowledge. The realisation of truth (*tattvadarśana*) is the aim for a system of thought. The systems are divided into two groups named *āstika* and *nāstika*. The word '*āstika*' means one who has faith in the authority of the *Vedas*. The word '*nāstika*' denotes one who has no faith in them. When these two terms are applied to the systems of Indian thought, the systems of Cārvāka, Buddha and Jaina come under the *nāstika* fold, while the *āstika* group comprises the *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Śāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Mīmāṁsā* and *Vedānta*. To have faith in the authority of the *Vedas* does not mean possession of slavish dependence on the *Vedas*. Any system owing allegiance to the *Vedas* is permitted to subject the *Vedas* to an analytical and critical study and draw the conclusions which it considers logically valid.

The *Upaniṣads* have been the fountain-source of all kinds of speculations *nāstika* and *āstika*, though the systems of *nāstika* group would deny all authority to the sources. Some of these have become turned into *darśanas*, while others got merged among the latter. Some were codified in the form of *sūtras* while others remained as they were. The exponents of each system were fully conversant with almost all these. Hence whenever a system contains references to other or rival views, it must be taken as a reference to these speculative theories as such and not to any particular text-book containing them. Hence the talk of redaction of the *sūtras* of the systems is meaningless, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

CHAPTER XXXII

NASTIKA SYSTEMS

CARVAKA SCHOOL

This school is materialistic in outlook. The doctrines of this school are as old as humanity. Anything, which is beyond the reach of the sense organs, is denied to exist. Hence no means of proof other than perception.[1] There is neither god nor other world. There is nothing like a soul distinct from the physical body. There is no pleasure apart from the worldly ones. Their motto in life is to enjoy life at all costs. There is no independent work representing this system. The doctrines of this system are to be known from the works on other systems. One Bṛhaspati is cited as an authority and quotations attributed to him are found in the *Sarvadarśana-saṁgraha* of Mādhava (1350 A.D.) of Vijayanagar. The *svabhāva-vāda*, *niyativāda*, and *yadṛcchāvāda* represent the materialistic views on causation.

BUDDHISM

The system of *Buddhism* was founded by Gautama (535-485 B.C.), a prince of Kapilavāstu. He noticed the sufferings of the people and practised meditation seeking the means to remove the sufferings. He became enlightened (*buddha*) on getting the means and thereafter came to be called Buddha. He evolved certain doctrines which became the foundations of *Buddhism*. Life is full of misery. Sufferings are due to actions which are actuated by desires and passions. Such actions lead the person to series of births and deaths. The desires and passions are born out of ignorance. The right knowledge of this would destroy ignorance which would gradually lead to the removal of suffering. This absence of suffering would be brought about by meditation. This stage is called '*nirvāṇa*' which means blowing out or extinction of everything that leads to suffering. Buddha did not indulge in any speculation. His silence over matters like God, soul and others which he believed in before he turned a recluse points to the fact that he would not have taught anything against the Vedic doctrines, at any rate those of the *Upaniṣads*.

The pupils of the Buddha were of different calibre. Some of them could not understand the theory of voidness along with the existence of the world which is felt. As a result of their varying powers of understanding, there arose four schools named *Vaibhāṣika*, *Sautrāntika*, *Yogācāra* and *Mādhyamika*. The one doctrine that is central to all the schools is that every object is momentary in existence. The first school holds both knowledge and knowables as real. The second school admits the reality of knowledge and seeks to prove the reality of the knowables through inference. The third school believes in the existence of knowledge only which is idealism. (*vijñānavāda*). The last mentioned school denies existence even to knowledge and believes in voidness which is nihilism (*śūnyavāda*). Saṅghabhadra and Kātyāyana were the early writers of the *Vaibhāṣika* school, Kumāralabdha of the Sautrāntika schooi, Maitreyanātha and Ārya Asaṅga of the *Yogācāra* school (*vijñānavāda*) which had *yoga* (meditation) and *ācāra* (practise) and Nāgārjuna of the *Mādhyamika* school so called because of the objects which are neither absolutely real nor unreal and thus were not in either of the extremes.

---

[1] Purandara, a materialist admitted inference within the worldly limits. *Tattvasaṁgraha* p. 431

About 100 A.D., the leading Buddhists drew the line of distinction among the four schools referred to above marking them as of the higher course and lower course. The latter which came to be called *Hīnayāna* included the *Vaibhāṣikas* and *Sautrāntikas*. The adherents of this course were of average ability and sought to get their own salvation. The former one, which is called *Mahāyāna*, included the *Yogācāras* and *Mādhyamikas*. The followers of this course were men of superior calibre who would achieve their salvation without the assistance of others and could work for other's salvation. The followers of the *Hīnayāna* used *Pāli* for literary purposes while those of the *Mahāyāna* used *Saṁskṛta*.

Since the Buddha did not leave behind him any work, we are to be guided by the works of the later writers to understand the essential features of the system. Whether the Buddha taught all these cannot be said at this stage. For instance, the later scholars hold that the knowledge of the existence of the soul would give rise in man to attachment, desires and passions. Therefore the soul and the world are denied to exist. Voidness (*śūnyatā*) is the ultimate truth.

Believing in the theories of *karma* and transmigration, the Buddhists evolved the concept of *bodhisattva* whose conduct is marked by the spirit of universal benevolence. A *bodhisattva* has to pass through many births before he becomes a Buddha. He must become perfect in the *pāramitas* (transcendent virtues) viz., *dāna* charity, *śīla* observance of moral conduct, *kṣānti* forbearance, *vīrya* energy, *dhyāna* meditation and *prajñā* knowledge. The monk puts these into practise in the cloisters while the householder in his daily life by self-sacrifice and devotion.

The speeches of the Buddha are said to have been recorded in the *Piṭakas* in *Pāli*. They represent the canons of the Buddhists. These *Piṭakas* are three, viz., *Sutta*, *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma*. The *Sutta* contains Buddha's serons. The *Vinaya* contains the rules of discipline and the precepts for the daily life of the monks and nuns.

The *Abhidhamma* deals with the philosophical discussions. The author of these is not known but the date of their composition is placed even before 240 B.C. The canons are also available in *Saṁskṛta* in fragments. Some among them are the *Pratimokṣasūtra*, *Vinayapiṭaka*, *Dīrghāgama*, *Madhyamāgama* and others.

There are texts in the form of fables which are authoritative to the Buddhists. The *Jātakas*, *Dhammapāda*, *Dīpavaṁśa*, *Avadānas* and others come under this group. The *Mahāvastu*, which belongs to the *Hīnayāna*, contains a number of *Jātakas*. The *Lalitavistara*, which is also called *Vaipulyasūtra*, is the most sacred text of the *Mahāyāna* containing the biography of the Buddha. Neither its date nor authorship is known. It was rendered into *Chinese* in the 9th century A.D. The fragmentary *Sūtrālaṅkāra* of Kumaralāta and the *Jātakamāla* of Āryaśūra deal with the *Jātakas* and *Avadānas*. The *Mahāyāna* doctrines are contained in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. The prose passages therein are in *Saṁkṛta* and the *gāthas* are in *Prākṛta*. It was rendered into *Chinese* in 223 A.D. The *Prajñāpāramitas*, which deal with the perfections of a *bodhisattva*, deal with nihilism and are in the form of *sūtras* varying in number. There are *Aṣṭasāhasrikāpāramita*, *Śatasāhasrikāpāramita* and so on. The *Laṅkāvatārasūtras* deal with the doctrines of nihilism and idealism. The magic formulas are treated in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*. The *Samādhirāja* deals with meditation. The ten stages to be gone through by a *bodhisattva* in order to attain Buddhahood are dealt with in the *Daśabhūmīśvarā*. The nihilistic doctrines are dealt with in the *Gaṇḍavyūha* and *Tathāgataguhyaka*.

About the beginning of the Christian era, the Buddha became deified. He came to be treated as *Tāyin*, *Bhagavāū*, *Sugata* and *Sarvajña*. The *Aṅguttaranikāya*, *Buddhavaṁśa* and *Lalitavistara* recommend the worship of the Buddha as the means for salvation. Aśvaghoṣa emphasised devotion to him. The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* deals with temples of the Buddha and stresses on getting his mercy. Mañjuśrī, Avalokiteśvara and Tārā became the deities of worship. All these are dealt with in the *Avalokiteśvaraguṇakaraṇḍavyūha*, *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, *Karmapuṇḍarīka* and *Avataṁsakasūtra*. The *Ādikarmapradīpa* deals with the rituals of the Buddhists which include magic and mysticism according to the *Vajrayāna*, the monistic and *Tāntric* form of Buddhism.

The ultimate truth of nihilism is that everything is a void. Till this is realised, the phenomenal world which exists will have to be accounted for as the modification of knowledge (*jñāna*). This is called *ālayavijñāna*. The knowledge which is produced on account of the experiences gained with the aid of the senses is called *pravṛttivijñāna*. Perception and inference are the two means of proof recognised for understanding this.

The earliest writer to deal systematically with the Buddhist doctrines was Aśvaghoṣa whose *Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda* deals with the doctrines of *Mahāyāna* which he is said to have founded along with Nāgārjuna a master in many branches of learning most of whose works are available in the Tibetan and Chinese versions. The important works of Nāgārjuna are the *Mādhyamikasūtras* with his own commentary *Akutobhayā*, *Sūryasaptati*, *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya*, *Upāyahṛdaya*, *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, *Pramāṇavidhvaṁsana* and others. Maitreya, who lived before 400 A.D., is the author of the *Abhisamayālaṅkārakārikā*, *Śaptadaśabhūmiśāstrayogācāryā* and *Bodhisattvacaryānirdeśa*. Asaṅga, pupil of Maitreya, is the author of the *Yogācārabhūmisūtra* and *Mahāyānasutrālaṅkārasūtra* with his own commentary. Vasubandhu, the brother of Asaṅga, was at first a follower of the *Hīnayāna* on which he wrote the *Gāthāsaṅgraha* and *Abhidharmakośa*. Later, he became the follower of the *Mahāyāna* and wrote a number of works, some among them being the *Vādavidhi*, *Vādamārga*, *Vādakuśala*, *Tarkaśāstra* and *Paramārthasaptati* a refutation of the *Sāṅkhyakārikā*.

Dinnāga, (c. 400 A.D.), a pupil of Vasubandhu, may be styled as the founder of Buddhistic logic. His works are the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* with his own *vṛtti*, *Hetucakra*, *Ālambanaparīkṣā with vṛtti*, *Trikālaparīkṣā* and others. The *Nyāyapraveśa*, which is attributed to him, is said to have been written by his pupil *Śaṅkarasvāmin*. Paramārtha (498-569 A.D.) translated a number of works into *Chinese*. Śāntideva of the seventh century is the author of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Dharmakīrti (C. 650 A.D.) was the greatest logician next only to Dinnāga. The well-known works of him are the *Pramāṇavārtika kārikā* with his own *vṛtti*, *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, *Nyāyabindu*, *Tarkanyāya*, *Santānāntarasiddhi* and *Sambandhaparīkṣā* with his *vṛtti*. The *Pramāṇavārtika* has commentaries by very eminent writers in the later period. They are Devendrabodhi, Śakyabodhi, Jinendrabuddhi, Ravigupta, Prajñākara, Jina, Yamāri and Śaṅkarānanda. Among these, Prajñākara's (C. 750 A.D.) commentary named *Pramāṇavārtikālaṅkāra* has influenced the later writers to such an extent as to win for Prajñākara the name *Alaṅkārakāra*. Śāntarakṣita (C. 750 A.D.) is the author of the *Tattvasaṁgraha* in which he discusses the principal doctrines of *Buddhism* contrasting them from those of other systems of thought and refuting them. This work was commented in 770 A.D. in the *Tattvasaṁgrahapañjikā* by Śāntarakśita's pupil Kamalaśila.

Kalyāṇarakṣita, who lived in the first half of the 9th century A.D., is the author of the *Sarvajñasiddhikārikā*, *Bāhyārthasiddhikārikā*, *Śrutiparīkṣā*, *Anyāpohavicārakārikā* and *Iśvarabhaṅgakārikā*. To the authorship of his pupil Dharmottara are attributed the *Nyāyabinduṭīkā*, *Pramāṇaparīkṣā*, *Apohanāmaprakaraṇa*, *Paralokasiddhi*, *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi* and *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā*. Pandita Aśoka, who lived at the end of the 9th century A.D., is the author of the *Avayavinirākaraṇa* and *Sāmānyadūṣaṇadikprasāritā*. The *Kāryakāraṇabhāvasiddhi*, *Vyāpticarcā* and *Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā* are the works of Jñānaśrī who was a reputed scholar of the Vikramaśilā University at the close of the tenth century. His pupil Ratnakīrti (C.1000 A.D.)

is the author of the *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi*, *Apohasiddhi*, *Sthirasiddhidūṣaṇa* and *Citrādvaitasiddhi.*

JAINISM

Vardhamāna Mahāvīra (599-527 B.C.) was the founder of Jainism. He reformed a creed which existed during his time and was propounded by Pārśvanātha (800 B.C.). He had twenty-three predecessors, the earliest being Ṛṣabha a saint who was the originator of the doctrine.

The Jains recognise the existence of the souls as distinct from matter which is real. The souls are many in number. They believe in the doctrines of transmigration and *karma*. Actions done in the previous births do not allow the knowledge of the soul to display itself. The physical body prevents the soul from making progress and hence is called '*āvaraṇa*'. The means to get rid of the body lies in the *Ratnatraya*, viz. *samyagdarśana*, *samyajñāna* and *samyakcāritra*. The first *ratna* consists in having faith in the Jain principles. The second consists in understanding the principles as they are taught by the Jain scholars. The last is abstaining from committing the sins that bind the soul to worldly life. While observing these three, one has to practise harmlessness (*ahiṁsā*), cheerful speech (*sūnṛta*) honesty or absence of theft (*asteya*), abstinence (*brahmacarya*) and non-acceptance of anything in the world or abandonment of delusion in the objects (*aparigraha*). The doctrine of *ahimsā* is carried to extreme limits in practise. Much stress is laid on asceticism. The goal of these observances is liberation from bondage. In the released state, the soul is eternally and absolutely free from the passions of the world. The causes of misery are completely removed. The soul does not get annihilated then. The souls are in a blessed state and are omniscient. In this state, they are designated *arhats*.

Vide :—सर्वज्ञो जितरागादिदोषस्त्रैलोक्यपूजितः ।
यथास्थितार्थवादी च देवोऽर्हन् परमेश्वरः ॥

Āptaniścayālaṅkāra

Perception, inference and verbal testimony (works of the Jain scholars) are the three means of proof admitted by this school. With reference to the existence of the material objects, the Jains formulate the theory of *syādvāda* according to which an object, when it is said to exist, does not exist in the form of those other than itself. Hence it can be said to exist in one respect and not to exist in some other respect. It can be referred to by a name and cannot be referred to by any other name. Thus an object may be referred to in more ways than one. Seven modes are adopted by the Jains to express the existence of an object, viz., an object is; it is not; it is and it is not; it is indescribable; it is and yet is indescribable; it is not and it is also indescribable and it is and it is not and it is also indescribable. This is called *saptabhaṅgīnaya* from the seven modes of reference.

After the death of Mahāvīra, his followers grouped themselves into two sects called *Digambara* and *Śvetāmbara*. The former which is also called *Nirgranthika* believes in giving up all one's belongings including the clothes in order to get salvation. Women are not eligible for salvation. The latter advocated the wearing of the white robes thereby extending the scope for salvation even to women. The *Digambara* sect seems to have been earlier in origin.

The earliest exponents of this system preached their doctrines in *Māgadhī Prākṛta*. Their writings too were recorded in *Prākṛta*. The *Siddhāntas* or *Agamas* are the sacred texts of the Jains. The earliest writer was Bhadrabāhu. There were two Jain writers with this name, the elder's period being 433-357 B.C., and that of younger the beginning of the first certury A.D. One among them was responsible for formulating the ten-membered syllogism. He wrote a *Prākṛta* commentary called *Daśavaikālikaniryukti* on the *Daśavaikālikasūtra* which contains the principles of Jaina logic. The idea of the categories and the method of comprehending them are treated by Umāsvāti in the first century A.D. in the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* which was commented by himself. The *Nyāyāvatāra*, a commentary on the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* and *Sammatitarkasūtra* on Jain philosophy in *Prākṛta* are the works of Siddhasena Divākara (C. 500 A.D.). The *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* was commented by Pūjyapāda Devanandin (C. 500 A.D..) in the *Sarvārthasiddhi*. It is held that this Pūjyapāda is identical with Jinendrabuddhi the grammarian. In the sixth century, the *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* was commented by Samantabhadra in the *Gandhahastimahābhāṣya*, the introductory portion of which is called *Āptamīmāṁsā*. About the same period, the *Āptamīmāṁśa* had a commentary by Akalaṅka who is the author of the *Nyāyaviniścaya*, *Tattvārthavārtikavyākhyānālaṅkāra*, *Laghīyastraya*, *Svarūpasambodhana* and others.

Māṇikyanandin (800 A.D.) is the author of the *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* on the means of proof which had the commentary *Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa* written on it by Prabhacandra (1000 A.D.), the author of the *Nyāyakumudacandrodaya*, a commentary on Akalaṅka's *Laghīyastraya*. The *Pramāṇamīmāṁsā* with commentary, *Vītarāgastuti* and *Āptaniścayālaṅkāra* are the works of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.). Devasūri, a contemporary of Hemacandra, is the author of the *Pramāṇanayatattvālokālaṅkāra* with his own commentary *Syādvādaratnākara*. The *Darśanaśuddhi* and *Prameyaratnakośa* are ascribed to the authorship of Candraprabha (1100 A.D.) Haribhadrasuri of the 12th century is known as the author of the *Saḍdarśanasamuccaya*, *Nyāyāvatāravivṛti*, *Yogabindu*, *Dharmabindu* and others. The Jain tradition makes him the author of 1400 works. The *Syādvādamañjarī*, which was written in 1292 A.D. by Malliṣeṇa as the commentary on the *Vītarāgastuti* of Hemacandra, gives a systematic exposition of the *syādvāda*. Rājaśekharasūri (1384 A.D.) is the author of many works among which the *Syādvādakalikā* and *Pañjikā* are well-known. The latter work is a commentary on the *Nyāyakandali* of Srīdhara.

Among the works one hundred and more in number written by Yaśovijayagaṇi (1608-1688 A.D.), tne wellknown are the *Nyāyapradīpa*, *Tarkabhāṣā*, *Nyāyarahasya*, *Nyāyāmṛtataranginī* and *Nyāyakhaṇḍakhādya*.

The duties of the Jains, laymen and monks, are given in the *Yogabindu* and *Dharmabindu* of Haribhadrasūri and in the *Praśnottaropāsakācāra* of Sakalakīrti (1464 A.D.) who also wrote the Tattvārthasāradīpikā containing a full account of the works on the *Digambara* Jainism. Biographical and traditional are the contents of the *Upamitibhāvaprapañcakathā* of Siddharṣi (906 A.D.), *Dharmaparīkṣā* of Amitagati (1000 A.D.) and *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* and *Sthavirāvalīcarita* of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.). The *Mahābhārata* story is narrated to suit the needs of the Jains in the *Harivaṁśapurāṇa*, an earlier but a different version of the same by Jinasena (784 A.D.) and a later version of the same by Sakalakīrti and his pupil Jinadāsa in the 15th century. The lives of the Jain saints are glorified in the *Ādipurāṇa* of Jinasena of the ninth century A.D., *Uttarapurāṇa* in continuation of the former by Guṇabhadra (898 A.D.), *Padmapurāṇa* of Raviṣeṇa (660 A.D.) and *Pāṇḍavapurāṇa* of Śubhacandra (1551 A.D.).

CHAPTER XXXIII

ASTIKA SYSTEMS

NYĀYA, VAIŚEṢIKA, SĀṄKHYA AND YOGA

The *Āstika* systems are six in number viz., *Nyāya*, *Vaiśeṣika*, *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, *Mīmāṁsā* and *Vedānta*. The cardinal doctrines of these systems are derived from the Vedic texts and the growth of them can be traced to the period of the *Upaniṣads*. The doctrines of these systems are found in the form of *sūtras*. Bādarāyaṇa and Jaimini are the authors of the *Vedānta* and *Mīmāṁsā sūtras* respectively. The *Vedāntasūtras* are also called *Brahmasūtras*, as they deal with the *Brahman*. Bādarāyaṇa is identified with *V*yāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. Jaimini is stated to have been the pupil of Vyāsa. Kapila and Patañjali are the authors of the *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga sūtras* respectively. Patañjali is identified with Patañjali, the author of the *Mahābhāṣyā*. Gautama and Kaṇāda are the authors of the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika sūtras* respectively. These systmes have their own list of classification of realities (*tattva*) and recognise that final release could be obtained through their knowledge. In order to get this knowledge, each system has its own scheme of the means of proof.

NYĀYA-VAIŚEṢIKA

The word *nyāya* originally denoted the science of methodical reasoning as applied to the interpretation of the Vedic passages. This science was then known as *Ānvīkṣikī*. The word *vaiśeṣika* refers to the system which deals with the classification of matter and its products. The basis for the difference between one ultimate product of matter and another is the particularity (*viśeṣa*). Since the system admits this, it is called *Vaiśeṣika*. Another explanation is offered to account for this name. One who has grasped the doctrines peculiar only to this system is a *Vaiśeṣika*. Those doctrines are stated in the following *śloka* :—

द्वित्वे च पाकजोत्पत्ती विभागे च विभागजे ।
यस्य न स्खलिता बुद्धिस्तं वै वैशेषिकं विदुः ।।

The aims and purposes of the two systems are thus different but in the nature of the treatment of the respective subjects, each was influenced by the other. In the early stages, *Vaiśeṣika's* influence over *Nyāya* was greater than that of *Nyāya* over *Vaiśeṣika*. From the eleventh century A.D. the two systems became coalesced and have remained thereafter a combined system with the appellation *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*.

Of all the *sūtras* of the six *āstika* systems, those of the *Vaiśeṣika* are earliest in origin. This is borne out by the absence of any reference to any other school including the Buddhistic. The *sūtras* are loosely strung together written in an archaic manner. The date of the composition of the *sūtras* could be placed about 500 B.C. The author of the *sūtras* is Kaṇāda, otherwise known as Ulūka and Kāśyapa. In ten chapters, there are 369 *sūtras* which attempt to make an analytical study of the products of matter through similarity and dissimilarity. The *Vaiśeṣikas* were responsible for formulating the atomic theory according to which, an atom represents a sixth part of the smallest particle of matter visible to the naked eye. Every product is produced out of the combinations of these atoms which are indivisible and belong to the various elements. The properties of the products are to be traced to those of the atoms. The atoms of earth undergo changes on account of internal heat (*pāka*). When heat is applied to an object, it gets decomposed to the state of the atoms, which after having undergone changes, produce a fresh object. Since the effect of heat takes place in the atoms, this is called *Pīlupāka*, the word *pīlu* denoting the atom. The *Nyāya* system holds that under the same conditions, changes take place imperceptibly in the atoms and the composite whole also which does not get decomposed. Since the effect produced in the atoms is gradually seen in the pot (*piṭhara*), the composite whole in question, this is called *piṭharapāka*. The *Vaiśeṣika* system can be said to represent the metaphysical side of the Indian systems. In a restricted sense, it can be called the Physical science of India. Perception and inference are the only means of proof admitted by this system.

The *Nyāyasūtras* were composed by Gautama otherwise known as Akṣapāda. After the death of the Buddha, the followers of the *āstika* faith must have felt the need to formulate rules of reasoning to defend their systems from the attacks of the Buddhists. The old type of reasoning under the name *Ānvīkṣikī* could not have served this purpose. Hence a new system under the name *Nyāya* was begun by Gautama who could have composed the *Nyāyasūtras* about 400 B.C. This special purpose was sought to be served by the introduction into the *Nyāya* system of the topics, discussion (*vāda*), controversy (*jalpa*), cavil (*vitaṇḍā*), quibbling (*chala*), futile rejoinders (*jāti*) and vulnerable points (*nigrahasthāna*). The *Nyāya* system is concerned with the nature of the means of proof, their number and the methods of their application. Incidentally, many problems of metaphysical nature are taken up for discussion. Inference on the syllogistic side is well developed. Perception, inference, verbal authority and comparison are the four means of proof admitted in this system. The *Vedas* are of supreme authority, being the compositions of God. The proofs for the existence of God came to be dealt with in the later period by Uddyotakara, Vācaspatimiśra, Jayanta and Udayana. The dialectics of this system became so perfected that this method of treatment including the terminology was adopted by the writers on other systems of thought on non-*śāstric* subjects also. Both the *Vaiśeṣika* and *Nyāya* systems consider the created products as produced anew and therefore are said to adopt *Ārambhavāda* and *Asatkāryavāda*.

The *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* were commented by Praśastapāda (C 350 A.D.) in the *Padārthadharmasaṁgraha* which is also referred to as *Padārthapraveśaka*. Praśastapāda's work is rather an independent treatise on the *Vaiśeṣika* system than a commentary on the *sūtras*. It was commented by Vyomaśiva (C. 900 A.D.) in the *Vyomavatī*, Śrīdhara (991 A.D.) in the *Nyāyakandalī*, Udayana (C. 1000 A.D.) in the *Kiraṇāvalī* and Śrīvatsa in the *Līlāvatī*. The last mentioned work is not available now. According to some scholars, the *Ātreyatantra*, which is now lost and whose authorship is not known, is one of the commentaries on the *Padārthadharmasaṁgraha*. No information is available about the *Rāvaṇabhāṣya*, *Bhāradvājavṛtti* and *Kaṭandī* of Rāvaṇa, the former two being the commentaries on the *sūtras* and the last one a treatise on the *Vaiśeṣika* system.

Vātsyāyana also known as Pakṣilasvāmin (C.200 A.D.) is the author of the *Nyāyabhāṣya*, the commentary on the *Nyāyasūtras*. Bhāradvaja Uddyotakara (C.600 A.D.) commented on the *Nyāyabhāṣya* in the *Nyāyavārtika*. This work contains a refutation of Dinnāga's critcism of the *Nyāyabhāṣya*. Dharmakirti's criticisms of the *Nyāyavārtika* were all refuted by Vācaspatimiśra (841 A.D.) who wrote the *Tātparyaṭīkā* on the *Nyāyavārtika*. In 841 A.D., Vācaspatimiśra wrote the *Nyāyasūcīnibandha* an index to the *Nyāyasūtras*. The date 898 which he gives at the end of this work may be taken to refer to the Śaka era and hence would correspond to 976 A.D. Besides, the Buddhist writers who lived only after this period refer to him.

Udayana was the first writer to write both on *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika*. Besides the *Kiraṇāvalī* on the *Padārthadharmasaṁgraha*, he is the author of a commentary *Tātparyapariśuddhi* on Vācaspatimiśra's *Tātparyaṭīkā*. He wrote two independent treatises the *Ātmatattvaviveka* on an inquiry into the nature of the self and the *Nyāyakusumāñjali* on proofs for the existence of God. The former work is also called by the name Bauddhadhikkāra. He gives an independent treatment to the futile rejoinder (*jāti*) and vulnerable point (*nigrahasthāna*) in the *Nyāyapariśiṣṭa* also known as *Bodhasiddhi*. His *Lakṣaṇāvalī* deals with the definitions of the *Vaiśeṣika* topics. His contributions to the *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems and to theism in particular won him the coveted title *Nyāyācārya*. The date given by him for the date of the compostion of the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* appears to be defective in the reading and when corrected would give a date corresponding to 1054 A.D. which is correct on the strength of internal evidences available in his works.

Jayantabhaṭṭa (C.880 A.D.) of Kashmir is the author of the *Nyāyamañjarī*, an independent treatise on the *Nyāya system* together with incidental comments on the *Nyāyasūtras*. His other work

Nyāyakalikā contains an enumeration of the categories. Jayanta had the title *Vṛttikāra*. He is the earliest writer to adopt the literary style for *śāstraic* subjects. Perhaps his contemporary was Bhāsarvajña, the author of the *Nyāyasāra* which deals for the first time with the topics of the *Nyāya* system under the heads of *pramāṇas*. Bhāsarvajña does not recognise *upamāna* as a *pramāṇa*. Many commentaries were written on this work, the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* being the most wellknown among them. Bhāsarvajña himself is the author of this commentary according to some scholars. Others simply refer to the author of this as Bhūṣaṇakāra. This commentary however is lost. A contemporary of Jayantabhaṭṭa was Trilocana, the preceptor of Vācaspatimiśra and the author of a *Nyāyamañjarī* which is now lost.

Śivāditya (C.1100 A.D.) is the author of the *Saptapadārthī*, *Lakṣaṇamāla* and *Hetukhaṇḍana*. He is reputed to have been the founder or propagator of the *Mahāvidyā* mode of argumentation. About the same period, Śrīvallabha composed the *Nyāyalīlāvatī* a treatise on the *Vaiśeṣika* system. In the beginning of the 12th century, Varadarāja wrote his *Tārkikarakṣā* with his own commentary *Sārasaṅgraha* on it. About the same period, Śaśadhara dealt with the important topics of the *Nyāya* system in the *Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa*. Many more works which were written about this period are now lost and are known from references to them in the works of writers like Udayana, Kamalaśila, Vādidevasūri and others. Some of the writers referred to by these scholars are Śaṅkarasvāmin, Ātreyabhāṣyakāra, Ratnakośakāra, Sānātani, Śrīvatsa, Praśastamati, Aviddhakarṇa, Viśṇubhaṭṭa, Viśvarūpa, Harihara, Bhāvivikta and Vādivāgīśvara. The name of the work of the last-mentioned writer is given as *Mānamanohara*. Some among these writers could have lived in the beginning of the 13th century.

The *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* systems, which were treated by the early writers with reference to the study of the knowables received a different treatment at the hands of Gaṅgeśa (C. 1300 A.D.) who wrote the *Tattvacintāmaṇi* in four chapters each chapter dealing with one *pramāṇa*. Many were the commentaries and subcommentaries written on this work. Vardhamāna (C. 1300 A.D.), son of Gaṅgeśa commented on his father's work, the *Nyāyalīlāvatī* and the works of Udayana. Jayadeva (C. 1500 A.D.), is the author of the *Tattvacintāmaṇyāloka* on Gaṅges's work. His erudition in the field of logic got him the title *Pakṣadharamiśra*. His pupil Rucidatta commented on his master's work *Āloka* and those of Vardhamāna. Vāsudevasārvabhauma, the leader of the *Nyāya* school at Navadivīpa in Bengal in the 15th century, had four illustrious pupils named Raghunāthaśiromaṇi also known as Tārkikaśiromaṇi, Raghunandana the lawyer, Kṛṣṇānanda the Tāntrika and Caitanya the founder of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. Raghunāthaśiromaṇi's (C. 1500 A.D.) works are called *Dīdhiti* which are in the form of commentaries on the works of Udayana, Gaṅgeśa and others. Jagadīśa, Gadādhara and Annambhaṭṭa were the eminent logicians of the 17th century. They commented on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, *Āloka* and others.

Besides these commentaries on the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*, several independent treatises also were written during this period. About 1250 A. D. Sarvadeva, Maṇikaṇṭha and Vādīndra wrote the *Pramāṇamañjarī*, *Nyāyaratna* and *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* respectively. The *Tarkabhāṣā*, *Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa* and *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī* are the works of Keśavamiśra (1150 A.D.), Raghunāthaśiromaṇi (C. 1500 A.D.) and Jānakinātha (C. 1550 A.D.) respectively. Śaṅkaramiśra of the 15th century commented on the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* in the *Upaskāra* and wrote two independent works *Kaṇādarahasya* and *Vādivinoda*. Viśvanāthanyāyapañcānana (1634 A.D.) dealt with the fundamental principles of the system in the *Bhāṣāpariccheda* also known as *Kārikāvalī* together with the *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* his own commentary on it. He is the author of the *Nyāyasūtravṛtti*, a commentary on the *Nyāyasūtras*. Jagadīśa (C. 1635 A.D.) is the author of the *Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā* on semantics, *Tarkāmṛta* on the principles of the system and *Bhāṣyasūkti*, a commentary on the *Praśastapādabhāṣya*. To the same period belongs the manual *Tarkakaumudī* of Laugākṣi Bhāskara. Gadādhara's *Vyutpattivāda* and *Śaktivāda* on semantics are highly valuable and well-known works. Annambhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṁgraha* with his own commentary *Dīpikā* on it has become a very popular work for those who begin the study of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems.

SAṄKHYA

The germs of this system are to be traced to the Vedic period. The word *sāṅkhya* is found used in the early texts like the *Bhagavadgīta* in the sense of knowledge. The name of the sage Kapila is associated with the origin of this system. In this system, matter (*prakṛti*) and soul are two eternal and separate entities in the world. Matter has three attributes *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* in the state of equilibrium. When the state of equipoise is disturbed, matter begins to evolve into *mahat* or buddhi (intellect) from which is produced *ahāṅkāra ego*). The eleven sense organs, five subtle and five gross elements are produced out of ego. The soul does not undergo any change at any time. The nature of the functions of the intellect, ego and mind is decided by the influence of the three attributes of matter. In the state preceding creation, the matter is called '*avyakta*' and in the state of the created products, it is called *vyakta*. That is, the products themselves are called by the name *vyakta*. Thus effect is in the cause in a latent form. The cause itself is transformed into the effect. Hence this system is said to adopt the *Satkāryavāda* and *Pariṇāmavāda*.

When a cognition is produced in the intellect, it is known with the help of ego and mind. The soul looks into the intellect which behaves like a mirror and mistakes the impressions created there, as a result of the cognitions, as belonging to itself. The soul suffers owing to this erroneous identification. This erroneous knowledge could be got rid of by acquiring the correct knowledge of matter and soul. The soul is neither bound nor released. Perception, inference and verbal testimony are the means of proof admitted in this system.

Kapila, the expounder of the principles of the system, taught them to Āsuri who in his turn communicated them to Pañcaśikha. Vārṣagaṇya is said to have written the *Saṣṭitantra* which is now lost. What these writers taught appears to have had a theistic colouring. The path of rituals was not favoured. The *Sāṅkhyasūtras* attributed to Kapila appear to have been written or come into vogue about 1400 A.D., as writers on other systems before this period did not cite them as authority. Probably, the influence of *Buddhism* turned the original *Sāṅkhya* atheistic.

The *Tattvasamāsa* of unknown authorship is considered as the basic text of this system. The views of the early writers were summarised by Iśvarakṛṣṇa (C. 250 A.D.) in the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* containing seventytwo *kārikās*. This work is held authoritative by later writers. Identity of Iśvarakṛṣṇa with Vindhyāvāsa is not established beyond dispute. The *Sāṅkhyakārikā* was commented by Paramārtha, Māṭhara, one Rājan,[1] Gauḍapāda and Vācaspatimiśra. The *Sāṅkhyasūtras* also called *Sāṅkhyapravacanasūtras* were commented in the *Sāṅkhyasūtravṛtti* by Aniruddha of the 15th century and in the *Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya* by Vijñānabhikṣu (C. 1550 A.D.), the author of a manual *Sāṅkhyasāra*.

YOGA

The Yoga system, accepting the principles of *Sāṅkhya*, improves upon them. Since the mere knowledge as stated in the *Sāṅkhya* cannot help in getting release, this system lays down rules for practical life based on the *Sāṅkhya* principles. Control over the activities of the *buddhi* is needed. This is technically called *Yoga*.[2] The system gives detailed methods of this control. The ultimate goal is absolute existence (*kaivalya*) of the soul. Control over the functions of *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra* and *manas* is very hard to contemplate and extremely difficult to practise. The process of meditation may be interfered with by obstacles over which the person who meditates will have no control. Hence meditation on God is suggested as an alternate means to avoid these obstacles. God is omniscient and helps those who seek His protection. He is not the creator of the world. According to the commentators on the *Yogasūtra*, the matter evolves at God's will.[3] Eight stages are prescribed to be gone through when the functions of the *buddhi* are to be controlled.[4] The methods of control recognise the different levels of fitness of the practisers of *Yoga*. By having absolute control over the *buddhi*, *ahaṅkāra* and *manas*, one can do

---

1. *Nyāyamañjari* I p. 100
2. *Yogasūtra* I. 1
3. *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* of Vyāsa I. 25
4. „ II. 29

and get whatever is desired. Since God is admitted in this system, this is called *Seśvarasāṅkhya*.

The earliest text of this system is the *Yogasūtras of* Patañjali (150 B.C.), the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*. That the authors of the *Yogasūtras* and the *Mahābhāṣya* are identical is proved through tradition and supported by a reference to the doctrine of *Sphoṭa* in the Yogasūtras.[1] These *sūras* which are 193 in number are divided into four sections under the names *Samādhi*, *Sādhana*, *Vibhūti* and *Kaivalya*. These have the commentaries of (1) Vyāsa of the fourth century A.D. called *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* which was commented by Vācaspatimśra (850 A.D.) in the *Tattvavaiśāradī* (2) Bhoja of Dhāra (1005-1054 A.D.) in the *Rājamārtāṇḍa* and (3) Vijñānabhikṣu (C. 1550 A.D.) in the *Pātañjalabhāṣyavārtika*. The last-mentioned writer is the author also of the *Yogasārasaṁgraha* on the essential principles of the *Yoga* system.

The Yogic practices are of two kinds viz., *Rājayoga* and *Haṭhayoga*. The former deals with the concentration of the mind. The latter is concerned with the practices calculated to rid the body of all impurities and is dealt with in the *Haṭhayogapradipika* of Svātmārāmayogīndra. Posture (*āsana*) is given importance for getting perfection in the technique of bodily control. The *Haṭhayoga* practices are associated with gross material ends. Other texts on this are the *Gorakṣaśataka*, *Gheraṇḍasaṁhitā* and others.

---

[1] *Yogasūtra* III. 17

CHAPTER XXXIV

ĀSTIKA SYSTEMS

MIMĀṀSĀ

The *Mīmāṁsā* system is concerned with the interpretation of the *Vedas*, of the *karmakāṇḍa* portion in particular. Therefore it is called *Pūrvamīmāṁsā* as contrasted from the *Vedānta* which is called *Uttaramīmāṁsā*. Even in this portion, the *Brāhmaṇas* form the basis for this system. This system has rules of interpretation (*nyāya*) and was referred to as *Nyāya* in the early periods. These rules have been found very useful for interpreting the passages in the *Upaniṣads* and *Dharmaśāstras*. While the other systems of thought are concerned with the means for an escape from life which is treated as a bondage, this system has an appeal to those who desire to know the nature of life and wish to live happily leading a virtuous life. The *Vedas* are the highest authoritative texts. They are themselves valid, not being the compositions of any person. The leading exponents of this system had to lay emphasis on the intrinsic and infallible evidence of the Vedas in order to defend the Vedic religion from the attacks of the Buddhists and Jains. That the world does never change, there is no heaven apart from the world and the gods do not have bodies are the characteristic features of the literature of this system. In the later period, theism got included as one of the topics, though not as a fundamental principle. Every obligatory act (*nitya*) is to be performed, as otherwise it would bring in the sin of omission (*pratyavāya*). Its peformance makes the soul purified.

Jaimini is the author of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras* which are 2744 in number distributed in twelve chapters having more than one thousand sections (*adhikaraṇa*). The date of their composition may be assigned to about 300 B.C. These were commented by Upavarṣa (C. 50 B.C.-C.50 A.D.), Bhavadāsa (C. 100 A.D.), Śabarasvāmin (C. 200 A.D.) and Bhartṛmitra (C. 300-600 A.D.). Upavarṣa is said to have composed the *Vṛtti* on both the *Mīmāṁā* and *Vedānta sūtraṣ*. The works of all these commentators are lost except the *Bhāṣya* of Śabarasvāmin.

The *Bhāṣya* of Śabarasvāmin was commented by Kumārilabhaṭṭa (600-660 A.D.) and Prabhākara (610-690 A.D.). The latter is said to have been the pupil of the former and was conferred the title *Guru* for his superior skill in interpreting the *Vedas*. The presence of the impressions produced by the deeds of an individual brings in worldly bondage. Final release is the condition when the soul would be free from the impressions. *Dharma* and *Adharma* denote the good and bad results of the actions in the school of Kumārila which came to be called *Bhāṭṭa* school and denote the good and bad actions themselves in the school of Prabhākara which came to be called *Gurumata*. Besides these two, there arose a third school founded by Murāri (C. 1200 A.D.) who commented on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabarasvāmin following the method of Kumārila but differing from him in certain matters.

Kumārila admits six means of proof viz., perception, inference, verbal testimony, comparison, presumption and negation. Prabhākara admits five means of proof leaving negation. Kumārila's comentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śabara is in three parts viz., *Ślokavārtika* a metrical commentary on the first quarter of chapter I of *Jaimini's sūtras*, *Tantravārtika* in prose and verse from the second quarter of chapter I up to chapter III and *Tupṭīkā* on the remaining portion. His *Bṛhaṭṭikā* and *Madhyamaṭīkā*, which are known only from the citations in the works of later writers, are respectively an elaborate and its summarised version of the commentaries on Śabara's *Bhāṣya*. Prabhākara's commentary on the *Bhāśya* of Śabarasvāmin are of two parts viz., *Bṛhatī* also called *Nibandha* and *Laghvī* otherwise known as *Vivaraṇa*. Murārimiśra's commentary on Śabara's *Bhāṣya* is called *Tripādanītinayana*. It is available on the second, third and fourth quarters of the first chapter. It is not known whether he commented on the whole of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras*. His *Aṅgatvanirukti* is an independent treatise on the relation of subsidiary and principal subjects.

Maṇḍanamiśra (615-695 A.D.), who was a contemporary of Kumūrila, was a great Mīmāṁsaka and Vedāntin. He is identified or is connected with Bhaṭṭa Uṁveka, Viśvarūpa and Sureśvara, all of them brought into relationship with Śaṅkara as his pupils or contemporaries . His works on *Mīmāṁsā* are *Vidhiviveka*, *Bhāvanāviveka* and *Mīmāṁsāsutrānukramaṇikā*. The *Vidhiviveka* has a commentary *Nyāyakaṇikā* by Vācaspatimiśra, the author of the *Tātparyaṭīkā*. The *Bhāvanāviveka* was commented by Bhaṭṭa Uṁveka.

The commentaries on the *Ślokavārtika* of Kumārilabhaṭṭa are the *Tātparyadīpikā* of Bhaṭṭa Uṁveka (640-725 A.D.), *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamiśra (C.1000 A.D.), *Nyāyaratnākara* of Pārthasārathimiśra (C. 1050 A.D.), and *Śarkarikā* of Jayamiśra (C. 1100 A.D.). The comentaries on Kumarila's *Tantravārtika* are the *Tautātitamatatilaka* of Bhavadevabhaṭṭa (C. 1100 A.D.) whose another name was Bālavalabhībhujaṅga, *Nyāyasudhā* also called Rāṇaka of Someśvara (C. 1200 A.D.), *Ajitā* of Paritoṣamiśra (C. 1200 A.D.), *Tantravārtikavivaraṇa* of Gaṅgādharamiśra (C.1250 A.D.), *Nibandhana* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (C. 1600 A.D.), the author of the *Nārāyaṇīya* and *Subodhinī* of Annambhaṭṭa (C 1700 A.D.) who is the author of the *Tarkasaṁgraha* and of the *Rāṇakojjīvanī*, the commentary on Someśvara's *Nyāyasudhā*. The commentaries on the *Tupṭīkā* are the *Tantraratna* of Pārthasārathimiśra, the author of the *Nyāyaratnākara* and *Vārtikābharaṇa* of Veṅkaṭamakhin, son of Govindadikṣita (C. 1600 A.D.).

The *Bṛhatī* of Prabhākara has a commentary called *Ṛjuvimala-pañcikā* written by Śālikanātha (650-730 A.D.), a pupil of Prabhākara. The *Laghvī* of Prabhākara was commented by the same writer in the *Dīpaśikhāpañcikā.* Kśīrasamudravāsimiśra, probably a follower of the Prābhākara school, is the author of the *Bhāṣyadīpa*, a commentary on *Śabara's Bhāṣya.*

Besides commenting on the works of Prabhākara, Śālikanātha annotated the *Bhāṣya of* Śabarsvāmin in the *Mīmāṁsāsūtrabhāṣya-pariśiṣṭa* and wrote an independent treatise called *Prakaraṇapañcikā* on the doctrines of the Prābhākara school. Vācaspatimiśra (C. 850 A.D.), who was a close follower of Maṇḍanamiśra in *Mīmāṁsā,* discusses the causes of verbal cognition in the *Tattvabindu.* Pārthasārathimiśra, the commentator on Kumārila's works, is the author of the *Śāstradīpikā* an independent treatise exhaustive and comprehensive on the *Mīmāṁsā* system according to the school of Kumārila. He is the author also of the *Nyāyaratnamālā* on the differences between the *Bhāṭṭa* and *Prābhākara* schools. The commentaries on the *Śāstradīpikā* are the *Mayūkhāvalī* of Appayadikṣita (C.1600 A.D.), *Mayūkhamālikā* of Somanātha (C. 1600 A.D.), *Prakāśa* of Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (C. 1600 A.D.), *Āloka* of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (C. 1612 A.D). the author of the *Nirṇayasindhu* and *Karpūravartikā* of Rājacūdūmaṇidīkṣita (C. 1620 A.D.). The *Nāyakaratna* of Rāmānujācārya (C. 1750 A.D.) is the commentary on Pārthasārathimiśra's *Nyāyaratnamālā.* The *Nayaviveka* of Bhavanātha (C. 1120 A.D.) explains the various sections in the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras* in the light of Prabhākara's views. Someśvara (C. 1200 A.D.), the author of the *Nyāyasudhā*, is the author of an independent treatise called *Tantrasāra* which is now lost.

The names of some writers whose works are lost, are mentioned in the works of later writers. Some of them are Sāmaṭa, Yajñaṭa, Mahodadhi, Mahāvrata, Śrīkara, Prakāśa, Candra and Vidagdha. The *Bhāṣya* of Devasvāmin (C. 1000 A.D.) on the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtras* is now lost. Among the works that are now available, the *Prabhākaravijaya* of Nandīśvara and *Nītitattvāvirbhāva* of Cidāndapaṇḍita belong to the thirteenth century. Mādhava (1297-1386 A.D.), the minister of the kings of Vijayanagar, composed the *Jaiminīyanyāyamālā* in verse with his own conmentary in prose.

Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.), is the author of the *Vidhirasāyana* with his own commentary *Sukhopajīvanī, Citrapaṭa, Upakramaparākrama* and *Vādanakṣatramālā.* The *Tantrasiddhānta* is the work of the grammarian Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.) who refers to Appayadīkṣita as his preceptor. Laugākṣi Bhāskara (C. 1600 A.D.) is the author of the manual *Arthasaṁgraha.* The *Mīmāṁsāsūtras* were commented by Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita (C. 1620 A.D.) in the *Tantraśikhāmaṇi.* To the first half of the seventeenth century belong a host of writers on *Mīmāṁsā.* Veṅkaṭādhvarin, the author of the Viśvaguṇādarśa, has to his credit the *Nyāyapadma, Mīmāṁsāmakaranda* and

Vidhitrayaparitrāṇa. The *Bhāṭṭacintāmaṇi* is the work of Viśveśvarasūri also called Gāgābhaṭṭa. Āpadeva's *Mīmāṁsānyāyaprakāśa* is a popular manual on the system. Khaṇḍadeva's works betray theistic influences. His works are the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, *Bhāṭṭarahasya*, *Phalaikatvavāda* and *Mīmāṁsākaustubha*. Annambhaṭṭa's (C. 1700 A.D.), *Rāṇakabhāvanākārikāvivaraṇa* contains an exposition of the *kārikās* in the *Nyāyasudhā* of Someśvara. The *Tantrarahasya* is an incomplete running commentary on the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras* by Rāmānujācārya (C. 1750 A.D.) according to the *Prābhākara* system. The *Adhvaramīmāṁsākutūhalavṛtti* is a commentary on the *Mīmāṁsāsūtras* by Vāsudevādhvarin (C. 1750 A.D.), the author of the *Bālamanoramā* on the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. A lucid expostion of the *Bhāṭṭa* school is contained in the *Bhāṭṭasāra* of Kṛṣṇatātācārya of the last century.

In continuation of the twelve chapters of *Pūrvamīmāṁsā*, there existed four chapters of *sūtras* called *Saṅkarṣakāṇḍa*. They are not now available but from references, it is found that this section dealt with the deities invoked in the sacrifies. These *sūtras* were commented by Upavarṣa, Bhavadāsa, Devasvāmin, (C.1000 A.D.) Rājacūdāṇmaṇidīkṣita and Bhāskararāya.

CHAPTER XXXV

ĀSTIKA AND RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS

VEDĀNTA

The *Vedānta* system is based on the *jñānakāṇḍa* portion of the *Vedas* which is represented by the *Upaniṣads*. Since the *Upaniṣads* represent the concluding portion, this system is called *Vedānta*. This deals with the nature of the Supreme being called *Brahman*, selves (*ātman*) and world and the interrelation between them. Hence it is also called *Brahmamīmāṁsā*.

The passages in the *Upaniṣads* are manifold. Some among them speak of the souls, God and world as distinct from each other and so are called *bhedaśruti*. Some speak of the oneness or identity of the many things which appear to be different from each other and are called *abhedaśruti*. There are others called *ghaṭakaśruti* which seek to establish a relation between the *bhedaśruti* and *abhedaśruti*. The *Upaniṣads* do not contain any thing like a systematic exposition of a single doctrine. There are more than one system of *Vedānta* each based on the teachings of the *Upaniṣads*.

The fundamental doctrines of the *Vedānta* system are based on the *Vedāntasūtras* also called *Brahmasūtras* 555 in number distributed among 192 sections (*adhikaraṇa*). These *sūtras*, which are contained in four chapters, are attributed to the authorship of Bādarāyaṇa who is identified with Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata*. He is distinct from Vyāsa in the opinion of some scholars. The date of the *sūtras* is fixed about 500 B.C. The four chapters of these sūtras are called *Samanvaya* proving the nature of the Brahman, *Avirodha* refuting the views of other schools of thought, *Sādhana* dealing with the means to get *mokṣa* and *Phala* stating the resutls achieved by these means. These *sūtras* are said to be in continuation of the *Saṁkarṣakāṇḍa* consiting of four chapters. The systems of *Vedānta* take support from the *Bhagavadgītā* also. The *Upaniṣads*, *Brahmasūtras* and *Bhagavadgīta* which form the basis for the *Vedānta* systems are called *Prasthānatraya*. All the schools of *Vedānta* have commentaries on these three texts and derive support from them, *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*.

Some of the *Vedānta* systems and religious schools base their authority on the *Āgamas* in addition to these three texts and some are based mainly on the *Āgamas*. The *Āgamas* are known as *Tantras* also. They prescrible the mode of worshipping a particular deity and a way of life in conformity with the nature of that worship.

They must have taken their rise as a result of the influence the *Brāhamaṇa* portions of the *Vedas* exercised on those men who preferred the path of devotion (*bhakti*) to that of *karma*. They took their rise even before the *Mahābhārata* which refers to them. Some of the *Āgamas* are designated *Saṁhitās* showing their connection with the Vedic texts. They deal in general with *jñāna* (knowledge), *yoga* (concentration), *kriyā* (action) and *caryā* (daily rites). All the *Āgamas* admit that the world is real, and consits of the Supreme Being, individual souls and material objects. The Supreme Being is the lord of the worlds. The *Āgamas* are of three types according to the deities worshipped. Thus there are the *Vaiṣṇava*, *Śaiva* and *Śākta Āgamas*.

The *Brahmasūtras* were commented by Bodhāyana identical with Upavarṣa, the commentator on the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtras*. Bodhayana was also called *Kṛtakoṭi*. Brahmanandin also called Taṅka is known as the author of the *Vākya*, a commentary on the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* and came to be referred to as *Vākyakāra* by later writers. The *Vākya* was commented in the *Bhāṣya* by Dramiḍācārya. All these writers preceded Saṅkara (632-664 A.D.). Their works are known only from the references and citations in the works of later writers.

The main schools of *Vedānta* are *Dvaita*, *Advaita*, *Viśiṣṭādvaita* and *Śuddhādvaita*. The minor schools are those of Bhāskara, Yādavaprakāśa, Nimbārka, Caitanya and Śivādvaita.

DVAITA

This system is based on the *bhedaśruti* of the *Upaniṣads*. The *abhedaśrutis* and *ghaṭakaśrutis* are so interpreted as to lend support to the main doctrine of dualism (*dvaita*). Matter (*prakṛti*), souls and God are eternal, mutually different and different in themselves. God is Viṣṇu who has a body not made up of matter (*aprākṛta*). He is omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent. At His will, the matter changes into the world. Among the souls, Lakṣmī is at the head and is the only soul having permanent existence as the wife of Viṣṇu. Other souls are in bondage. The souls are atomic in size and divided into male and female which distinction is maintained even in the state of release. The relationship between God and souls is one of master and servant. Every soul has to render service to Viṣṇu according to the accepted principles and get His favour. The course of *bhakti* is to be adopted by the souls. Perception, inference and verbal authority are the three means of proof admitted by this school. The *Vedas* are eternal and authoritative in themselves. The *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* are also admitted as part of verbal testimony.

The founder of this school was Ānandatīrtha, whose original name was Vāsudeva. He was the pupil of Acyutaprekṣācārya. His pupils were Padmanābhatīrtha, Naraharitīrtha, Mādhavatīrtha and Akṣobhyatīrtha. The period of his life was 1199-1277 A.D. His titles were *Pūrṇaprajña*, *Madhyamandāra* and *Madhva*. He is the author of thirty-seven works all written to uphold the *Dvaita* view against that of *Advaita*. On the *Brahmasūtras*, he wrote the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, *Brahmasutrāṇubhāṣya* a brief commentary and *Brahmasūtrānuvyākhyāna* usually called as *Anuvyākhyāna* explaining the difficult *sūtras*. On the *Bhagavadgītā* was written the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*. His *Bhagavadgītātātparyanirṇaya* expounds the significance of the teachings of the *Gītā*. Prominent among his other works are the *Ṛgbhāṣya*, *Tattvaviveka*, *Tattvasaṁkhyāna*, *Tattvoddyota*, *Prapañcamithyāttvakhaṇḍana*, *Pramāṇalakṣaṇa*, *Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇaya*, *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya* and *Bhāgavatavyākhyā*.

Next in importance to Madhva is Jayatīrtha, the pupil of Akṣobhyatīrtha. He lived in the second half of the 14th century. He commented on almost all the works of Madhva. The place of *Dvaita* among the systems of *Vedānta* is mainly due to his writings. His *Nyāyasudhā*, *Pañcikā*, *Tattvaprakāśikā* and *Prameyadīpikā* are the commentaries respectively on Ānandatīrtha's works *Brahmasūtrānuvyākhyāna*, *Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍana*, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* and *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*. His independent works are the *Vādāvalī* and *Pramāṇapaddhati*, the former being an adverse criticism of the *māyā* doctrine of *Advaita*.

Citsukha's *Tattvapradīpikā* has an adverse criticism in the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsayati (C. 1500 A.D.) which was replied by Madhusūdanasarasvati (C. 1570 A.D.) in his *Advaitasiddhi*. Rāmatīrtha (C. 1620 A.D.) answered the objections raised against *Dvaita* by the author of the *Advaitasiddhi* in the *Taraṅgiṇī*. Vyāsayati's *Bhāvaprakāśikā* and *Tātparyacandrikā* are the commentaries respectively on Jayatīrtha's *Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍanapancikā* and *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyatattvaprakāśikā*. The *Bhāvadīpikā* and *Parimala* of Rāghavendrayati (1600 A.D.) are the commentaries on Jayatīrtha's *Tattvaprakāśikā* and *Nyāyasudhā* respectively. His *Tantradīpikā* is a comemntary on Madhva's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. He is the author of the *Gītārthasaṁgraha*, a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* and of the *Nyāyamuktāvalī* an independent treatise on the *Dvaita* system. Vādirāja, Vijayīndra and Srīnivāsatīrtha are other great writers who developed the system by their contributions.

ADVAITA

This school is based on the *abhedaśrutis* of the *Upaniṣads*. Existence is of three kinds viz., real, empirical and apparent. That which does not change at any time has real (*pāramārthika*) existence. That which is produced at a particular time and destroyed at another cannot be said to have existence in the real sense of the word. It may be useful for worldly transactions and so has empirical (*vyāvahārika*) existence. That which has a semblance of existence by appearing to exist like another has only apparent (*prātibhāsika*) existence. The world is changing, has existence and was created. It is bound to come to an end. This may have empirical value. After the purpose is served, it ceases to exist. Really speaking, it appears to exist. The world consisting of the souls and inert matter has therefore existence like the mirage. Hence it does not exist . What really exists is the Brahman which is attributeless. The apparent existence of the world is due to *māyā* which has been screening the *Brahman*. Nescience (*māyā*) is of the nature of the three qualities *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. The existence of *māyā* can be neither affirmed nor denied. It defies description and hence it is *anirvacanīya*. It is unreal because it is said to be destroyed. The terms *māyā*, *avidyā*, *ajñāna* and *moha* are synonyms. *Māyā* has two aspects with *sattva* predominant in one and being secondary in the other. It is called *māyā* in the former and *avidyā* in the latter. The *Brahman* is reflected there and appears like the world. The reflected image of the *Brahman* in the *sattva* dominated portion is called *Iśvara* and that in the *avidyā* is the world consisting of the souls and matter. Thus the same attributeless *Brahman* appears like the gods, souls and matter. It is also held that the reflection of the *Brahman* in *antaḥkaraṇa* which is a product of *māyā* represents the individual souls many in number as *aṇtaḥkaranas* also are many. Because of *māyā*, the real nature of the *Brahman* is not understood and therefore the world is believed to exist.

This school admits the world to be real till the truth of monism (*advaita*) is realised. According to the nature of the medium, the reflections come to possess certain attributes. Gods, possess many qualities because of the *sattva* dominated *māyā* and the souls have few of them on account of *avidyā*. Hence the souls are required to worship the gods. Through such worship and performances of the obligatory duties, the soul gets the internal sense (*citta* or *antaḥkaraṇa*) purified and the three qualities gradually getting weakened and finally destroyed. Then it becomes one with the *Brahman* or realises that it was only a shadow or reflection of the *Brahman*. Thus there is identity between the soul and the *Brahman* and because of this, the system is called *Advaita*. The experience of this identity can be had in one's life time. Then it is called *Jīvanmukti* and the final release, which takes place after the separation of the soul from the physical body is called *videhamukti*. So long as the soul is here, the rules and disciplines laid down by the *Dharmaśāstra* are binding on it. This school follows the views of the *Bhāṭṭa* school of *Mīmāṁsā*. The path of knowledge (*jñānamārga*) is to be pursued for obtaining *mokṣa*. The *māyā* theory is also called illusionistic (*Vivartavāda*).

Among the early writers of this school, Bhartṛprapañca and Gauḍapāda (520-620 A.D.) are mentioned as authorities. No work of the former has come down. The latter is the author of the *Māṇḍūkyakārikā* a metrical exposition of the *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*. Maṇḍanamiśra (615-695 A.D.), the Mīmāṁsaka and Vedāntin is the author of the *Brahmasiddhi*, *Sphoṭasiddhi* and *Vibhramaviveka*. The *Brahmasiddhi* gives a clear exposition of *Advaita* and was commented by Vācaspatimiśra in the *Brahmatattvasamīkṣā* which is now lost. The

Sphoṭasiddhi upholds *Śabdādvaita* which was advocated by Bhartṛhari. The *Vibhramaviveka* deals with the theories of error. It is held that Maṇḍanamiśra was defeated in a debate by Śaṅkara and became an ascetic-pupil of the latter with the name Sureśvara. Some scholars do not believe in the identity between Maṇḍanamiśra and Sureśvara.

Śaṅkara was born in 632 A.D. at Kāladi in Kerala. He studied *Vedānta* under Govindabhagavatpāda, a pupil of Gauḍapāda. At a very early age, he became an ascetic and preached the Advaita doctrines of which he gave a systematic exposition. He died at the early age of thirty-two. He did not admit the validity of the *Āgamas*. He commented on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Bhagavadgītā* and the major *Upaniṣads*. Among his other works, the important are the *Ātmabodha*, *Daśaślokī*, *Aparokṣānubhūti*, *Prapañcasāra*, *Upadeśasāhasrī*, *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, *Praśnottararatnamālikā*, *Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya* and others. Sureśvara (620-700 A.D.), who is identified with Maṇḍanamiśra, is the author of the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadvārtika* *Pañcīkaraṇavārtika*. and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*. Together with Sureśvara, there were four pupils of Śaṅkara. Among the other three, Padmapāda commented on Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, Toṭaka is the author of the *Śrutisārasamuddharaṇa*, a metrical treatise on the *Advaita* doctrines as preached by Śaṅkara and Hastāmalakācārya is the author of the *Vivekamañjarī* on *Advaita*.

Among the commentaries on Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, those which are well-known are the *Pañcapādikā* on chapter I and the first quarter of chapter II by Śaṅkara's pupil Padmapāda (625-705 A.D.), *Bhāmatī* by Vācaspatimiśra (850 A.D.), *Prakaṭārthavivaraṇa* by Anubhūtisvarūpācārya (C. 1200 A.D.), *Nyāyanirṇaya* by Ānandagiri (C. 1250 A. D.), *Bhāṣyabhāvaprakāśikā* by Citsukha (C. 1250 A.D.) and *Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā* by Govindānandasarasvatī (C. 1550 A.D.). Ānandagiri, who was also known as Ānandajñāna, commented on the *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya* and *Upaniṣadbhāṣyas*, and other works like the *Upadeśasāhasrī* of Śaṅkara. Padmapāda's *Pañcapādikā* has a valuable commentary called *Vivaraṇa* by Prakāśatman (C. 950 A. D.'. Amalānanda (C. 1250 A. D.) is the author of the *Vedāntakalpataru*, a commentary on Vācaspatimiśra's *Bhāmatī*. The *Parimala* is the commentary on the *Vedāntakalpataru* by Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.).

The *Saṁkṣepaśārīraka* of Sarvajñātman (C. 900 A.D.) gives a summary of Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. The *Pramāṇalakṣaṇa* and *Pañcaprakriyā* are the other works of the same writer. Prakāśātman's (C. 950 A.D.) *Nyāyasaṁgraha* is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. Vimuktātman's (C. 1000 A.D.) *Iṣṭasiddhi* is a polemical treatise on *Advaita*. Bhoja (1005-1054 A.D.) is said to have written a *Rājamārtāṇḍa* on Advaita. Towards the end of the 12th century, Śrīharṣa, the author of the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, wrote the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya* a polemical treatise mainly directed against the *Nyāya* system and in support of *Advaita*. Amalānanda (C. 1200

A.D.), the author of the *Vedāntakalpataru*, is the author of the *Śāstradarpaṇa*, a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. Citsukha (C. 1250 A.D.) is the author of commentaries on the *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya*, *Brahmasiddhi* and *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*. His *Tattvapradīpikā* is an independent treatise on *Advaita*. This work was criticised by the Dvaitin Vyāsayati (C. 1300 A.D.) in the *Nyāyāmṛta*. Vidyāraṇya, who is identified with Mādhava of Vijayanagar (1297-1386 A.D.), is the author of the *Vivaraṇaprameyasaṁgraha*, *Anubhūtiprakāśa*, *Pañcadaśī*, *Jīvanmuktiviveka* and *Vaiyāsikyanyāyamālā*. The last mentioned work is said to have been written by Vidyāraṇya and Bhāratītīrtha.

The *Advaitamakaranda* is a metrical summary of the *Advaita* doctrines by Lakṣmīdhara (C.1450 A.D.). The *Advaita* manuals *Vedāntasāra* and *Tattvaviveka* with *Tattvavivekadīpana* are the works of Sadānanda and Nṛsiṁhāśrama respectively of the 16th century A.D. To the same period belongs the *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* on the logic and metaphysics of *Advaita* by Dharmarājādhvarin. Vijñānabhikṣu of the same period and author of works on *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* is the author of the *Vijñānāmṛta* the commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. The *Advaitasiddhi* of Madhusūdanasarasvati (C. 1600 A.D.) is in defence of the *Advaita* school and is a criticism of the *Nyāyāmṛta* of Vyāsayati. His other works are the *Siddhāntabindu* a commentary on the *Daśaślokī* of Śaṅkara, *Gūḍhārthadīpikā* a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* and *Prasthānabheda* on the branches of study. *Gurucandrikā* and *Laghucandrikā* are respectively an elaborate and concise commentaries on the *Advaitasiddhi* by Brahmānandasarasvatī (C. 1620 A.D.). These two commentaries contain the refutations of the views expressed in the *Nyāyāmṛtataraṅgiṇī* of the Dvaitin Rāmācārya. Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.) is the author of the *Siddhāntaleśasaṁgraha* containing a list of the doctrines of *Advaita*, *Nyāyarakṣāmaṇi* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* and *Nayamañjarī* on the tenets of *Advaita*. Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.), the grammarian and pupil of Appayadīkṣita, is the author of the *Tattvakaustubha* on the principles of the *Advaita* system. The *Mitākṣarā* is Annambhaṭṭa's (C. 1700 A.D.) commentary on the Brahmasūtras.

VIŚIṢṬĀDVAITA

This school admits three realities God, souls and matter. The *bheda*, *abheda* and *ghaṭaka* passages of the *Upaniṣads* are all taken as valid proving that the *Brahman* is the only one reality having for its modes the animate beings (souls) and inanimate objects. The modes are mutually different. They qualify the *Brahman* from which they are different. There is only one namely *Brahman* qualified by these and hence the appellation "*Viśiṣṭādvaita*" for this school.

Vide :—अशेषचिदचित्प्रकारं ब्रह्मैकमेव तत्त्वम् ।
तत्र प्रकारप्रकारिणोः प्रकाराणाञ्च मिथोऽत्यन्तभेदेऽपि
विशिष्टैक्यादिविवक्षयैकत्वव्यपदेशः तदितरनिषेधश्च ।

Nyāyasiddhāñjana I

The souls, which are atomic in size and matter, represent the body of God. They exist only for the sake of God. Hence they are called *śeṣa* and God becomes *śeṣin*. The *śeṣin* has control over the *śeṣa* as the soul has over the body.

Vide :—परगतातिशयाधानेच्छया उपादेयत्वमेव
यस्य स्वरूपं स शेषः परः शेषी ।

Vedārthasaṁgraha.

The souls are of three types viz., *baddha* those in bondage, *mukta* released and *nitya* eternally free. Viṣṇu, His consort Lakṣmi, Ādiśeṣa, Garuḍa and others come under the last class. The paths of devotion and self-surrender (*prapatti*) are recommended to be adopted for getting salvation. Those who are not qualified for the path of devotion shall take to the path of self surrender. In the state of *mokṣa*, differences among the souls are wiped out, and there is 'unitive consciousness and abolition of pluralistic consciousness'. There is the loss of self-feeling' in that state but not self-existence.' It is one of bliss in the company of other released souls. Viṣṇu with Lakṣmī is the *Brahman*. A section of this school treats Lakṣmī as an ordinary soul and consort of Viṣṇu. The Brahman has a body made of pure *sattva* (*śuddhasattva*).

Perception, inference and verbal testimony are the means of proof admitted by this school. In addition to the *Upaniṣads*, *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgītā*, this school treats the *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* and *Divyaprabandha* as authoritative texts. The *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* are of two types viz., *Pāñcarātra* and *Vaikhānasa*. These speak of the Brahman as having five-fold existence viz., *para* in Vaikuṇṭha, *vyūha* in the milky ocean, *vibhava* in the incarnated forms, *antaryāmin* dwelling within every thing and *arcā* in the idols that are worshipped. The *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* prescribe the way of life, and rules for worshipping God. They derive their name from the five-fold duties of routine life viz., *abhigamana* going to the temple of God, *upādāna* collecting the materials for worship, *ijyā* worship, *svādhyāya* study of the sacred texts and *yoga* meditation. The doctrines of the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas* were preached by Aniruddha one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu to Nārada, Sanaka, Śāṇḍilya and others. Hence these are called *Bhagavacchāstra*. These doctrines could be traced to the *Nārāyaṇīya* section of the *Mahābhārata*, *Bhagavadgītā*, *Bhāgavata*, *Nāradasūtras* and *Śāṇḍilyasūtras*. The name *Vaikhānasa* for the other type of the *Vaiṣṇava Āgamas* is derived from Brahmā who is called Vikhanas. Vikhanas taught the doctrines of these *Āgamas* to Atri, Marīci, Kāśyapa and Bhṛgu each of whom brought out his own version of the doctrines. Both these *Āgamas* are as valid as the *Vedas*. The works representing these are designated *Saṁhitā*. There were 108 *saṁhitās* of the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas*. Only some among these are now available. Among them, the *Pauṣkara*, *Sāttvata*, *Jayākya*, *Ahirbudhnya*, *Iśvara*, *Pādma*, and *Pārameśvara saṁhitās* are important. The *Divyaprabandhas* are four thousand stanzas in Tamil composed by holy saints called Ālvārs. This is considered to be as valid as the *Vedas.*

The earliest authorities of this school were Taṅka, Dramiḍa, Guhadeva, Upavarṣa and others. Next to the Ālvārs, the great authority on this system is Nāthamuni whose full name is Raṅganāthamuni (823-923 A.D.). His works *Nyāyatattva* and *Yogarahasya* are now lost. His grandson Yāmuna, who was born in 916, is the author of the *Āgamaprāmāṇya* vindicating the validity of the *Pāñcarātra Āgamas*, the *Siddhitraya* comprising *Ātmasiddhi*, *Iśvarasiddhi* and *Saṁvitsiddhi*, the *Gītārthasaṁgraha* and *Mahāpuruṣanirṇaya.*

Rāmānuja was born in 1017 A.D. at Śrīperumbudur near Kāñcī. At first he studied *Advaita* in Kāñcī under Yādavaprakāśa and laer became a pupil of Mahāpūrṇa, a disciple of Yāmuna. He preached the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* doctrines which he systematised in his works which are seven in number under the names, *Śrībhāṣya*, a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Vedāntasāra* and *Vedāntadīpa* which are shorter commentaries on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*, *Vedārthasaṁgraha* on the significance of the teachings of the Vedas, *Gadyatraya* and *Nitya* a manual for worshipping God. The commentaries on the *Śrībhāṣya* are the *Nāyaprakāśikā* and *Bhāṣyabhāvabodhana* of Meghanādāri, *Nyāyasudarśana* of Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka, *Śrutaprakāśikā* and *Śrutapradīpikā* of Sudarśanasūri, *Tattvaṭīkā* of Vedāntadeśika and *Mūlabhāvaprakāśikā* of Raṅgarāmānujamuni (C. 1600 A.D.). Meghanādāri and Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka lived about 1200 A.D. Sudarśanasūri lived about 1300 A.D. The *Śrutaprakāśikā* has a commentary *Bhāvaprakāśikā* by Raṅgarāmānujamuuni (C. 1600 A.D.)

Parāśarabhaṭṭa (C. 1100 A.D.), son of Śrivatsāṅkamiśra commented on the *Viṣṇusahasranāma* in the *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa*. Meghanādāri's *Nayadyumaṇi* is an independent treatise on the system. Varadācārya (C. 1250 A.D.) is the author of four short treatises *Prapannapārijāta*, *Prameyamālā*, *Tattvanirṇaya* and *Tattvasāra*. Sudarśanasūri, the author of the *Śrutaprakāśikā*, wrote the *Tātparyadīpikā* the commentary on the *Vedārthasaṁgraha* of Rāmānuja and the *Śukapakṣīya* a commentary on the *Bhāgavata*. *Ātreya* Rāmānuja (C.1300 A.D.), the preceptor of Vedāntadeśika, is the author of the *Nyāyakuliśa* in defence of this school. The following works written after Rāmānuja (1017-1137 A.D.) during this period are not available and are known only from the citations in later works:—Parāśarabhaṭṭa's *Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvayavivaraṇa* and *Tattvaratnākara*, Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka's *Prajñāparitrāṇa*, *Prameyasaṁgraha* and *Saṅgatimālā* of Viṣṇucitta, preceptor of Varadācārya (C. 1250 A.D.), *Mānayāthātmyanirṇaya* of Varadaviṣṇumiśra and *Śrībhāṣyavivaraṇa* a gloss on Rāmānuja's *Śrībhāṣya* and *Ṣaḍarthasaṁkṣepa* by Śrīrāmamiśra one of the chief disciples of Rāmānuja. The *Nyāyakalāpasaṁgraha* of Seneśvarācārya and *Nītimālā* of Nārāyaṇārya are respectively on the sections in the *Brahmasūtras* according to *Śrībhāṣya* and metaphysics of the school. These two are available but the dates of their composition cannot be ascertained.

After Rāmānuja, the greatest philosopher of the school is Vedāntadeśika (1268-1369 A.D.), the author of nearly 115 works in *Saṁskṛta* and *Tamil*. His independent treatises are the *Tattvamuktākalāpa* with his own commentary *Sarvārthasiddhi*, *Nyāyapariśuddhi*, *Nyāyasiddhāñjana*, *Mīmāsāpādukā*, *Adhikaraṇasārāvali*, *Śatadūṣaṇī*, *Saccaritrarakṣā*, *Nikṣeparakṣā* and *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*. He has distinguished himself as an authoritative exponent of this school through the works mentioned above and also by commenting on the works of his predecessors in the school. His commentaries are :—The *Tattvaṭīkā* a commentary on the *Śrībhāṣya* of Rāmānuja, *Seśvaramīmāṁsā*, a theistic exposition of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsāsūtras*, *Tātparyacandrikā* on Rāmānuja's *Bhagavadgītābhāṣya*, *Gītārthasaṁgraharakṣā* on Yāmuna's *Gītārthasaṁgraha*, *Rahasyarakṣā* on Rāmānuja's *Gadyatraya* and *Iśāvāsyopaniṣadbhāṣya* on the *Iśāvāsyopaniṣad*. His *Dramiḍopaniṣatsāra* and *Dramiḍopaniṣattātparyaratnāvalī* are the metrical renderings in *Saṁskṛta* of the *Tiruvāymoli* of Nammālvar. His *Mīmāṁsāpādukā* was commented by his son Varadācārya.

The *Nayamayūkhamālikā* of Appayadīkṣita (C. 1600 A.D.) is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras* in the light of *Viśiṣṭādvaita*. His contemporary Mahācārya is the author of the *Caṇḍamāruta* on Vedāntadeśika's *Śatadūśaṇī* and of six polemical treatises *Advaitavidyāvijaya*, *Gurūpasattivijaya*, *Parikaravijaya*, *Pārāśaryavijaya*, *Brahmavidyāvijaya* and *Sadvidyāvijaya*. About the same period lived Raṅgarāmānujamuni, the commentator on the *Srībhāṣya*. He acquired the name *Upaniṣadbhāṣyakāra* by commenting on the principal *Upaniṣads*. His *Śārīrakaśāstrārthadīpikā* is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*. His *Viṣayavākyadīpikā* contains an exposition of some important Upaniṣadic passages. Śrinivāsadāsa, a pupil of Mahācārya (C. 1600 A.D.), is the author of the *Yatīndramatadīpikā* also called by himself as *Śārīrakaparibhāṣā*, which is a manual of the *Viśiṣṭādvaita*. The *Vedāntakārikāvalī* of Bucci Veṅkaṭācārya (C. 1800 A.D.) is a metrical epitome of the principles of *Viśiṣṭādvaita*.

ŚUDDHĀDVAITA

In this system, the *Brahman* is both *saguṇa* and *nirguṇa*. It is the cause for the origin, maintenance and destruction of the world. It has *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda* as its attributes which are real. It is one and infinite, the *antaryāmin* of the individual souls and the material and efficient cause of the world. It is full (*pūrṇa*) and is called Puruṣottama having a body which is full of bliss. In these respects, it is having attributes (*saguṇa*). It does not have the attributes of ordinary persons and is therefore attributeless (*nirguṇa*). The individual souls are real, forming part of the *Brahman* and are like the sparks of fire in the form of the *Brahman*. They are atomic in size. Since they form part of the *Brahman*, they are not different from it. They are also *Brahman* with latent bliss (*ānanda*). Thus they are identical with the *Brahman*. The difference which is found to exist between the individual souls and the *Brahman* is not therefore natural but is due to the will of the *Brahman*. It is not due also to nescience (*māyā*) as in *Advaita* and therefore this school is called *Śuddhādvaita*. By His free will, God would give the individual souls a divine body as His own to sport with Him eternally. The relation between God and soul is one of the lord and lady (*nāyakanāyikābhāva*). Devotion and self-surrender are the means to get His grace and are called *Puṣṭi-mārga*. The God worshipped in this system is Kṛṣṇa under the names Gopījanavallabha, Śrī Govardhananāthajī or Śrīnāthajī.

Vide :—जानीत परमं तत्त्वं यशोदोत्सङ्गलालितम् ।
तदन्यदिति ये प्राहुरासुरांस्तानहो बुधाः ॥

Brahmasūtrāṇubhāṣya 4-4-22

The preceptor (*guru*) on earth is regarded as divine and gets divine honours. This school takes as authorities, the *Vedas*, *Bhagavadgītā*, *Upaniṣads* and *Bhāgavata*. One gets salvation by knowning the sevenfold meaning of the *Bhāgavata* viz., *śākhā*, *skandha*, *prakaraṇa*, *adhyāya*, *vākya*, *pada* and *akṣara*.

Vallabhācārya (1473-1531 A.D.) founded this school by commenting on the *Brahmasūtras* in the *Aṇubhāṣya*. This was left incomplete by him and was completed by his son Viṭṭhalanāthajī. His commentary on the *Bhāgavata* is *Subodhinī*. He wrote sixteen smaller treatises on the doctrines of this school. Puruṣottama, the pupil of Vallabha, is the author of the *Bhāṣyaprakāśa*, a commentary on the *Aṇubhāṣya*. The *Raśmi* is the commentary on the *Bhāṣyaprakāśa* by Gopeśvara. Vallabha's pupil Puruṣottama is the author also of the *Vedāntādhikaraṇamālā* an independent treatise on the system. The *Taittirīyopaniṣad* was commented by Śrījayagopala. Kṛṣṇa-candra's *Bhāvaprakāśikā* is a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*.

BHEDĀBHEDA

Apart from the four main schools of *Vedānta*, there are four minor ones all of them coming under *Bhedābheda* with marked differences in treatment. The word *bhedābheda* means distinction cum identity. This applies to cause and effect and to the *Brahman* and the world of animate and inanimate beings. This relationship is considred to be due to its own nature, a condition and is beyond one's thoughts. According to this, there are three kinds of *bhedābheda* viz., *svābhāvika* as held by *Yādavaprakāśa* and Nimbārka, *aupādhika* as held by Bhāskara and *acintya* as held by Caitanya. Bhartṛprapañca appears to have been a very early *Vedāntin* anterior to Śaṁkara. He appears to have advocated *Bhedābhedavāda* or *Dvaitādvaitavāda*. He based his view on the *Pariṇāmavāda* and advocated the paths of knowledge and action combined together (*jñānakarmasamuccaya*) as the means for salvation. His views are known only from the references in the works of later writers.

BHĀSKARA

Bhāskara lived after Śaṅkara (632-664 A.D.) and before Vācaspatimiśra (850 A.D.). He may be taken to have lived about 800 A.D. He is the author of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* in which he gives an exposition of his theory of *Bhedābheda*. According to him the relation "between Brahman and *acetana* is both different and non-different, while in the relation between *Brahman* and the *jīva*, difference is adventitious and non-difference essential." The *Brahman* is possessed of attributes and evolves itself into the world. Both knowledge and *karma* combined together represent the means for *mokṣa*. Owing to ignorance (*avidyā*), the self in the empirical stage is not in a position to realise its oneness with the *Brahman*. It is the *Brahman* that becomes evolved into the world on account of the *upādhis* which are the physical and psychical conditions. The soul gets united with these due to ignorance and *karma*. These conditions are real. Through the correct knowledge and righteous acts, the soul experiences his *abheda* with the *Brahman* and after getting freed from the physical organism becomes one with the *Brahman*. The individual souls are different from the *Brahman* due to *upādhi* and yet identical with it. Hence Bhāskara's view is called *Aupādhika Bhedābhedavāda*. Later writers refer to Bhāskara's view by using the word *tridaṇḍimata*.

YĀDAVAPRAKĀŚA

The identity of this *Vedāntin* is not established. It is not known whether he is identical with Yādavaprakāśa, the first teacher of Rāmānuja by whom he was converted into a *Viśiṣṭādvaitin*. Nor is it known whether he could have been the author of the *Vaijayantī* and *Yatidharmasamuccaya*. His views are criticised by Rāmānuja. His commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* is lost and he does not appear to have commented on the *Brahmasūtras*. He seems to have been influenced by Bhartṛprapañca and Āśmarathya in holding the *Svābhāvika Bhedābhedavāda*. According to him, the *Brahman* having attributes gets transformed, by its nature, into the selves and world which are real and different and non-different from it. The knowledge of difference brings in worldly bondage but *mokṣa* consists in the realisation of *bheda* and *abheda*. Like Bhāskara, Yādavaprakāśa advocates *jñānakarmasamuccaya*.

NIMBĀRKA

Nimbārka, who lived in the 12th century A.D., maintained *Svābhāvika Bhedābhedavāda*. He was influenced by Rāmānuja and

---

1. P. N. Śrinivasachari : The Philosophy of Bhedābheda p. 6

Auḍulomi. The *Brahman* within and without the world is identical and different from the world. It is identical with the world of animate and inanimate beings which depend on it for existence and action. It is different from it by its very nature. The *Brahman* has attributes (*saguṇa*) and has a spiritual form made of beauty and bliss called Rādhākṛṣṇa. Devotion and self-surrender are the paths of salvation. In the released state, the soul remains different from the *Brahman* but without its particularity. Nimbārka's system is called *Sanakasampradāya.*

Nimbārka's commentary on the *Brahamasūtras* is called *Vedāntapārijātasaurabha* which was commented by his immediate follower Śrīnivāsa. The doctrines of the system were dealt with by Nimbārka in the *Daśaślokī.* Keśavācārya also called Keśavakāśmīrin (C. 1600 A.D.) is the author of the *Kaustubhaprabhā* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, *Tattvaprakāśikā* a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* and commentaries on the important *Upaniṣads*, *Viṣṇusahasranāma* and other texts.

CAITANYA

The name of Caitanya is associated with the spread of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. His original name was Viśvambhara. He came to be called Gaurāṅga owing to his personal handsomeness. He was born in 1485 A.D., became an ascetic in 1509 with the name Śrī Kṛṣṇacaitanya and lived in that order for twenty-five years. He maintained *Acintya Bhedābheda* which is maintained by the *Brahman's svarūpaśakti* and *māyāśakti.* The *Brahman* conceived of as Kṛṣṇa pervades the universe and by the *vilāsaśakti* becomes as many Kṛṣṇas as there are gopis. By the *vaibhavavīlasa,* He becomes Vāsudeva, Saṁkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. The lord is to be approached only through devotion based on love.

Caitanya did not leave any work behind him in support of this doctrine. The authorship of the *Śikṣāṣṭaka* containing the dictates of this cult is attributed to him. Sanātanagosvāmin and Rūpagosvāmin were two prominent disciples of his. The former is the author of a commentary on the *Bhāgavata* and of an independent work *Bṛhadbhāgavatāmṛta.* The latter is the author of the *Laghubhāgavatāmṛta* and *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu.* He wrote, besides these two, a number of works which could be brought under poetry, lyrics, dramas etc. The mystical and metaphysical dogmas are dealt with in the *Bhāgavatasandarbha* of Jīvagosvāmin. The *Haribhaktivilāsa* of one Gopālabhaṭṭa deals with the rituals and religious practices of this school. The *Caitanyacaritāmṛta*, *Premavilāsa* and *Govindalīlāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇadāsakavirāja describe the lives of Caitanya, Sanātana, Rūpa and Jīvagosvāmins. In the light of the teachings of this school, Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa of the 18th century A.D. wrote the *Govindabhāṣya* a commentary on the *Brahmasūtrās.*

ŚIVĀDVAITA

The *Śivādvaita* school is almost the same as the *Viśiṣṭādvaita* except for the treatment of Śiva as the *Brahman*. The development of this school, which was perhaps founded by Śrīkaṇṭha, was closely associated with *Śaivism*. Śrīkaṇṭha, whose identity is not known, commented on the *Brahmasūtras* in the *Śrikaṇṭhabhāṣya* which represents an attempt to connect the religion of *Śaivism* which is based on the *Śaiva Āgamas* with the *Upaniṣads*. He must have lived about 1400 A.D., as there is no reference to this important school in the *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha* of Mādhava (C. 1350 A.D.) of Vijayanagar. Appayadikṣita (C. 1600 A.D.) is the author of the *Śivārkamaṇidīpikā* the commentary on the *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya*. His *Rāmāyaṇatātparyasaṁgraha* and *Bhāratatātparyasaṁgraha* represent his attempts at the interpretation of the epics in support of *Śaivism*. His other works on this school are the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā, Śikhariṇīmālā, Śivādvaitanirṇaya, Tattvasiddhāntavyākhyā* and *Nayamaṇimālā*.

ŚAIVISM

There are certain religious schools which are wholly based on the *Āgamas*. The *Pāśupata, Śaiva* and the *Kashmirian Śaivaite* schools are based on the *Śaiva Āgamas* which are said to be twenty-eight in number. While interpreting the *Brahmasūtra* पत्युरसामन्जस्यात (2-2-35), Śaṅkara refers to four schools of *Śaivism* viz., *Śaiva, Pāśupata, Kāruкasiddhāntin* and *Kāpālika*. Vācaspatimiśra calls the third by the name *Kāruṇika*. *Kālāmukha* is the name given to it by Rāmānuja. The word *kāruka* may be the corrupt form of *karuṣya* which is the name of one of the pupils of Lakulīśa, the founder of the *Pāśupata* school. There is no work representing the *Kāpālika, Kālāmukha* or *Kāruka* schools. Thus the systems mentioned by the *Vedāntins*, for which literature is available, are only two viz., *Śaiva* and *Pāśupata*. This is apart from the *Śaivaite* school of Kashmir.

ŚAIVA

This religious school is based on the *Śaiva Āgamas* such as *Mṛgendra, Pauṣkara, Karaṇa, Bahudaivatya, Kālottara, Saurabheya* and others. The six principles that are admitted by this school are *pati, vidyā, avidyā, paśu, pāśa* and *kāraṇa*. Śiva is the supreme God whose existence is proved by inference. He creates the world in accordance with the *karma* of the souls. He has a body made up of divine energy. This body is five fold according to the sacred formulas which constitue them. The five bodies are *Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Aghora, Tatpuruṣa* and *Iśāna*. On the removal of *pāśa* which is binding it to the world, the soul gets final release through devotion to Śiva and becomes Śiva. In that stage also it depends on Śiva. Śambhudeva and Śrīkaṇṭha, the author of the *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya* contributed to the philosophical representation of this system. Bhoja

(1005-1054 A.D.) of Dhārā is the author of the *Tattva prakāśa*, *Siddhāntasaṁgraha*, *Śivatattvaratnakalikā* and *Yuktikalpataru*. Siddhaguru, Bṛhaspati, Somaśambhu and Rāmakaṇṭha were some of the authorities of this school.

PAŚUPATA

This school was founded by Lakulin who lived about the second century A.D. He is also known as Nakulin. He was probably holding a *lakuṭa* or *laguḍa* which means the club. This school admits five principles viz., *kārya*, *kāraṇa*, *yoga*, *vidhi* and *duhkhānta*. Śiva acts independently and therefore does not need any thing even the *karma* of the souls for creating the world. The five principles have to be realised. Meditation, self-surrender and others are the means to get salvation which consists in the attainment of the highest powers unattended with worldly miseries.

Nakulīśa is the author of the *Śivasūtras*. Haradatta (C. 1100 A.D.) was a great authority of this school. The *Gaṇakārikā* was written by Bhāsarvajña (C.900 A.D.), the author of the *Nyāyasāra*.

VIRAŚAIVA

This school is an offshoot of the *Saivaite* schools of the *Āgamaic Śaivism* and *Pāśupata*. Basava (C. 1200 A.D.), a Brahmin of the *Ārādhya* sect, was the founder of this school which is also called *Liṅgāyata*. *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ānanda* form the essence of Śiva who is called *Sthala*. By the agitation of His innate power, *Sthala* becomes divided into, *Liṅgasthala* and *Aṅgasthala*. The former is Śiva omniscient, transcendent, and material and efficient cause of the world. The latter is the soul. Through devotion, the soul and Śiva shall get united. There are three stages in devotion viz., *yogāṅga*, *bhogāṅga* and *tyāgāṅga*. The *Śrīkarabhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras* by Śrīpati (C. 1400) gives an exposition of this school.

KASHMIR ŚAIVISM

In Kashmir, *Śaivism* had two fold development viz., *Spanda* and *Pratyabhijñā*.

The *Spanda* school was founded by Vasugupta (850 A.D.) to whom the *Śivasūtras* were revealed by Śiva. He taught them to Kallaṭa. According to this school, God is Śiva who is independent and creates the world by His free will. He is not the material cause nor does He need any help from *karma* or matter for this work. He appears Himself as many souls. Thus there is identity between God and the souls but this is not realised on account of three fold impurities viz., *āṇava*, which makes the self feel the limitations, *māyā* existence in the physical organism and *karma* consciousness that the soul had done deeds good or bad. These impurities would vanish through intense meditation and the vision of God.

Vasugupta's another work is the *Spandakārikā* which was commented in the *Spandasarvasva* by Kallaṭa. The other important works are the *Spandapradīpikā* of Utpala (C. 1000 A.D.) son of Udayakara and the *Spandanirṇaya* Kṣemarāja (C. 1000 A.D.)

The *Pratyabhijñā* school holds the same view about God as in the *Spanda* school. The soul, which is only God, is not able to recognise the bliss of godly nature in it. It is not aware of it. The recognition in the form 'I am God' would bring about final release and hence the name of the school. This recognition is not produced because of *māyā* which obscures the vision of the souls. In this respect, this system is nearer to *Advaita* than even to *Śaivism.*

The doctrines of this school were expounded by Somānanda (850 A.D.) in the *Śivadṛṣṭi.* His pupil Udayākara composed the *Iśvarapratyabhijñāsūtras.* Utpaladeva (C. 950 A.D.), perhaps different from the writer of the same name on the *Spanda* branch, is the author of the *Iśvarapratybhijñākārikā* and *Iśvarasiddhi* with his own *vṛtti* on both. Abhinavagupta (C. 1000 A.D.), the author of the *Dhvanyālokalocana*, enriched the *Pratyabhijñā* school by his contributions in the form of numerous works. His independent works are the *Bodhapañcadaśikā*, *Paryantapañcadaśikā*, *Mālinīvijaya vārtika*, *Parātriṁśikāvivaraṇa*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra*, *Anuttarāṣṭikā*, *Paramārthadvādaśikā*, *Paramārthacarcā*, *Mahopadeśaviṁśatikā* and others. His *Paramārthasāra* is a treatise on the *Sāṅkhya* principles in the light of the doctrines of this school. The *Bhagavadgītā* was commented by him in the *Bhagavadgītārthasaṁgraha.* He commented on Utpaladeva's *Iśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* and *Vṛtti* thereon and Somānanda's *Śivadṛṣṭi.* His *Prakīrṇakavivaraṇa* deals with the philosophical and grammatical aspects of this system. Some of his works are lost and are known from references in the works of later writers.

ŚĀKTAISM

The worship of *Śakti*, the personified form of energy, began very early in time. It was closely associated with the worship of a female deity. Caṇḍikā, Ambikā, Cāmuṇḍā, Durgā and others are the names for the same deity. The worship of this deity is based on five *Śubhāgamas*, sixty-four *Kaulāgamas* and eight *Miśrāgamas*. They enjoin the worship of the deity under the three names *Ānandabhairavī*, *Tripurasundarī* and *Lalitā*. The worship shall take three ways viz., *Devī* as seated in Śiva's lap, 2) *Cakrapūjā* and 3) study of the doctrines of the school. Much value is attached to the power of sounds, the presence in the human body of a number of threads of occult force (*nāḍī*) and six great centres of occult force (*cakra*) each resembling a lotus. Faith is laid in the mystic forms of *yoga*, magic power of diagrams (*yantra*) and gestures made with the figures (*mudrās*).

The *Śaktisūtras*, along with the *Āgamas*, are the earliest texts of this school. One Paraśurāma is said to have written the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra* which deals with the worship of *Śrīvidyā*. The *Lalitātriśatībhāṣya* and *Saundaryalaharī* of Śaṅkara are in favour of the worship of *Śakti*. Bhāskarācārya (C. 1000 A.D.) is the author of the *Śivasūtravārtika* the commentary on the *Śivasūtras* and an independent treatise *Varivasyāprakāśa*. The *Tantrarāja*, Brahmānanda's *Śāktānandātaraṅgiṇī*, Kṛṣṇānanda's *Tantrasāra* and Puṇyānanda's *Kāmakalā* are some of the important works of this school.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

No attempt was ever made to write a history of philosophy. Occasionally, the systems of thought were brought together and studied on the basis of certain similar features existing among them. To Śaṅkara's authorship is attributed the *Sarvasiddhāntasaṁgraha*. The *Tattvasaṁgraha* of Śāntarakṣita and *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* of Haribhadrasūri represent the attempts of the Buddhists and Jains respectively. The well-known work of this kind is the *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha* of Mādhava (C. 1350 A.D.) of Vijayanagar. There is an anonymous work with the name *Sarvamatasaṁgraha*. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's (C. 1600 A.D.) *Mānameyodaya* deals with the means of proof and knowables. The *Darśanodaya* and *Mānameyodayarahasyaślokavārtika* are the works of Mahāmahopādhyāya Lakṣmipuram Śrīnivāsācārya who lived in the first half of this century.

CHAPTER XXXVI

CONCLUSION

A perusal of the contents of the previous chapters would show that there had not been any branch of learning or topic which did not have its literature recorded in *Saṁskṛta*. In other words, the popularity of *Saṁskṛta* as a literary language is revealed here. The works mentioned so far in the different chapters here represent a very low percentage of the works written in *Saṁskṛta*. Some among them are available in print but most of them are in the manuscripts.

As its name suggests, *Saṁskṛta* became so perfected through the efforts of the grammarians that no other language could bear comparision to it in any respect whether pronunciation, diction, vocabulary or syntax. The languages in India have been influenced and enriched through their association with *Saṁskṛta*.

The importance of *Saṁkṛta* as the language of Indian literature is all the more great, because it is in the literature written in this language that India's cultural values are recorded. India's greatness has all along been mainly due to her cultural heritage. During the hours of need and trials, the countries, which lay beyond the frontiers of India, took inspiration and guidance from India. A study of the *Saṁskṛta* literature gives a vivid account of the various aspects of India's culture. More than material progress, spiritual progress received attention and gained significance in the daily life of the people. The importance of the soul and the care to keep it ever pure were always uppermost in the minds of the Indian thinkers. Material welfare was therefore shaped to suit the need of the soul. The age-long trials, underwent by the Indians, made them have faith in the doctrines of *karma*, *ahiṁsā* and transmigration. A thorough-going spirit of optimism and the courage to face the unexpeeted and the inevitable events in life have given the Indian nation a peculiar stamp and this has been mainly due to the influence of the Hindu religion and the observances which its adherents put to practise. It is because of this that rarely has an Indian, nay a Hindu, got fed up with the life herein and tried to escape from it, although the life in the world is taught in the sacred texts to be miserable and of an inferior kind when compared to the state of *mokṣa*. It is for the same reason that the changing political conditions and the ideologies attendant on them have not affected appreciably the way of life led by the people of this land.

With the advent of the foreigners on the Indian soil, India began to decline gradually in her cultural eminence. All the foreigners, without any exception attempted to destroy the cultural importance of India by underrating it. They have suggested a Greek origin for anything good and attractive in India and have endeavoured to show that the Buddhists had been the forerunners of the Hindus in every aspect of life. Little did they realise that the achievements of the Indians in every branch of learning and every walk of life should have been the results of trials and experiences undergone in the previous periods. The Greek records of the few centruries before the Christian era reveal the greatness of the Indians as members of a nation culturally and politically great and independent to no other nation in the world. The case of Buddhism has been a different one. Buddhism represents only an offshoot of Hinduism with emphasis laid on certain aspects of life. The Buddhists did not invent anything new. Yet, their doctrines are magnified beyond limits and glorified at the expense of Hinduism by those given to political ideologies.

Saṁskṛta literature alone serves as the key to discover the greatness of India. The entire field of the *Saṁskṛta* literature is based on the *Vedas*. The soul of India could be visualised only through the study of the *Saṁskṛta* literature interpreted in the light of the Vedic tradition. For this purpose, India's history requires a careful study in the light of the *Purāṇas* and other records which are far more faithful in the presentation of facts than the books written by the modern scholars who had admitted the Paurāṇic evidence with reservations.

The need for the study of the *Saṁskṛta* literature is of great importance to the progress of the Indian nation. Without reference to the past, the future cannot be shaped. "The whole past history of the world would be darkness to him, and not knowing what those who came before him had done for him, he would probably care little to do anything for those who are to come after him."[1] It is idle, as some do, to laugh at the glorious past merely blinded by the glamour of the present. Though material prosperity is essential for leading a happy life, spiritual values should not be allowed to be undermined by materialistic and utilitarian values of the West. "No nation on the surface of the earth has ever become great by despising its own glories and by eking out its miserable existence with a few crumps falling from the mouths of others."[2] India has to assert and maintain her individuality. The words of Prof. Max Muller about the advantage of studying *Saṁskṛta* deserve to be quoted here. "Take any of the burning questions of the day—popular education, higher education, parliamentary representation, codification of laws, finance emigration, poorlaw, and whether you have anything to teach and to try, or anything to observe and to learn, India will supply you with a laboratory such as exists nowhere else. That very *Saṁskṛta* the study of which may at first seem so tedious to you and so useless, if only you will carry it on will open before you large layers of literature, as yet almost unknown and unexplored, and allow you an insight into strata of thought deeper than any you have known before and rich in lessons that appeal to the deepest sympathies of the human heart.[1] Whatever sphere of the human mind you may select for your special study, whether it be language, or religion, or mythology, or philosophy, whether it be laws or customs, primitive art or primitive science, everywhere, you have to go to India, whether you like it or not, because some of most valuable and most instructive materials in the history of man are treasured up in India and in India only."[2]

---

[1] Max Muller : What can India Teach us. p. 17

[2] Pandit Baladeva Upadhyaya : Intoroduction to *Vedabhāṣyabhūmikāsaṁgraha*. pp. III & IV

---

1. Max Muller : What can India Teach us pp. 13 & 14
2. „ „ p. 15

Printed by
N. D. AGARWALA at the National Press,
Allahabad.

APPENDIX

Works based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Vālmīki is considered as the *Ādikavi*. He showed the way for later poets in the choice of the themes and also in the mode of writing. His greatness is due to the choice of Rāma as the hero of the poem. He himself advocated such a choice.

Vide :—न ह्यन्योऽर्हति काव्यानां यज्ञोभाग्राघवादृते ।

Rāmāyaṇa-Uttara—98-18

Among the statements sung in praise of Vālmīki by the later writers, the following deserve to be mentioned.

१. अहो, सकलकविसार्थसाधारणी खल्वियं वाल्मीकीया
सुभाषितनीवी ।

Anargharāghava-Prastāvanā

२. मधुमयफणितीनां मार्गदर्शी महर्षिः ।

Rāmāyaṇacampu I 8

३. स वः पुनातु वाल्मीकेः सूक्तामृतमहोदधिः ।
ओंकार इव वर्णानां कवीनां प्रथमो मुनिः ॥

Rāmāyaṇamañjarī

४. लंकापतेः संकुचितं यशो यत्
यत्कीर्तिपात्रं रघुराजपुत्रः
स सर्व एवादिकवेः प्रभावो
न कोपनीयाः कवयः क्षितीन्द्रैः ॥

Vikramāṅkadevacarita I 27

५. मुख्यमुनीनामिव तं कवीनां
नमामि येनागमकोविदेन ।
स्वकाव्यदेवायतनेऽधिदेवी
प्रतिष्ठिता राघवकीर्तिमूर्तिः ॥

Surathotsava I 30

The following is the list of important works based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Serial No.	Name of the work	Author	Type	Date.
1.	Abhiṣekanāṭaka	Attributed to Bhāsa	Drama	C. 200 B. C.
2	Pratimānāṭaka	"	"	"
3.	Yajñaphala	"	"	"
4.	Raghuvaṁśa	Kālidāsa	Poem	C. 50 "
5.	Kundamālā	Diṅnāga	Drama	200 A. D.
6.	Setubandha	Pravarasena	Poem	400 "
7.	Jānakīharaṇa	Kumāradāsa	"	520 "
8.	Rāvaṇavadha	Bhaṭṭi	"	650 "
9.	Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi	Śaktibhadra	Drama	700 "
10.	Rāmābhyudaya	Yaśovarman	"	"
11.	Uttararāmacarita	Bhavabhūti	"	"
12.	Mahāvīracarita	"	"	"
13.	Svapnadaśānana	Bhīmaṭa	"	800 "
14.	Anargharāghava	Murāri	"	900 "
15.	Bālarāmāyaṇa	Rājaśekhara	"	"
16.	Rāmacarita	Abhinanda	Poem	"
17.	Rāmāyaṇacampu	Bhoja	Campu	1050
18.	Mahānāṭaka	Hanumān	Drama	"
19.	Kanakajānakī	Kṣemendra	"	"
20.	Rāmāyaṇamañjarī	"	Poem	"
21.	Rāmapālacarita	Sandhyākaranandin	"	1150
22.	Prasannarāghava	Jayadeva	Drama	1270 "
23.	Unmattarāghava	Bhāskara	"	1350 "
24.	"	Virūpākṣa	"	"
25.	Raghunāthābhyudaya	Vāmānabhaṭṭabāṇa	Poem	1420 "

Serial No.	Name of the work	Author	Type	Date
26.	Ānandarāghava ..	Rājacūḍāmaṇidıkṣita	Drama	1620 A. D.
27.	Adbhutadarpaṇa ..	Mahādeva	"	1650 "
28.	Jānakīpariṇaya ..	Cakrakavi	Poem	"
29.	Uttaracampu ..	Veṅkaṭādhvarin	Campu	"
30.	Jānakıpariṇaya ..	Rāmabhadradıkṣita	Drama	1700 "
31.	Rāmakathā ..	Vāsudeva	Poem	"

Works based on the Mahābhārata.

Like the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* has been a popular work in the later period. The main story of the epic together with the episodes influenced the later writers in the selection of the themes for their compositions. The following passages from the epic prove this.

१. सर्वेषां कविमुख्यानामुपजीव्यो भविष्यति ।
पर्जन्य इव भूतानामक्षयो भारतद्रुमः ॥

Mahābhārata-Ādi I 108

२. इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्ते कविबुद्धयः ।
पञ्चभ्य इव भूतेभ्यो लोकसंविधयस्त्रय :॥

Mahābhārata-Ādi II 386

३. अनाश्रित्यैतदाख्यानं कथा भुवि न विद्यते ।
आहारमनपाश्रित्य शरीरस्येव धारणम् ॥
इदं कविवरैः सर्वैराख्यानमुपजीव्यते ।
उदयप्रेप्सुभिर्भृत्यैरभिजात इवेश्वरः ॥

Mahābhārata-Ādi 389-90

Bāṇa and Daṇḍin speak highly of Vyāsa and his epic.

Vide :—नमः सर्वविदे तस्मै व्यासाय कविवेधसे ।
चक्रे पुण्यं सरस्वत्या यो वर्षमिव भारतम् ॥

Harṣacarita—Introductory stanza 3

मर्त्ययन्त्रेषु चैतन्यं महाभारतविद्यया ।
अर्पयामास तत्पूर्वं यस्तस्मै मुनये नम :॥

Avantisundarī—Introductory stanza 3

The following is the list of important works based on the main story and prominent episodes of the *Mahābhārata*.

Serial No.	Name of the work	Author	Type	Date
1.	Dūtaghaṭotkaca ..	Attributed to Bhāsa	Drama	C. 200 B. C
2.	Dūtavākya ..	,,	,,	,,
3.	Karṇabhāra ..	,,	,,	,,
4.	Madhyamavyāyoga ..	,,	,,	,,
5.	Pañcarātra.. ..	,,	,,	,,
6.	Urubhaṅga ..	,,	,,	,,
7.	Abhijñānaśākuntala ..	Kālidāsa		C. 50 B. C
8.	Kirātārjunīya ..	Bhāravi	Poem	580 A. D.
9.	Veṇīsaṁhāra ..	Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa	Drama	650 ,,
10.	Śiśupālavadha ..	Māgha	Poem	700 ,,
11.	Subhadrādhanañjaya ..	Kulaśekharavarman	Drama	750 ,,
12.	Kīcakavadha ..	Nītivarman	Poem	900 ,,
13.	Bālabhārata ..	Rājaśekhara	Drama	,,
14.	Naiṣadhānanda ..	Kṣemīśvara	,,	,,
15,	Nalacampu ..	Trivikramabhaṭṭa	Campu	,,
16.	Bhāratamañjarī ..	Kṣemendra.	Poem	1050 ,,
17.	Citrabhārata ..	,,	Drama	,,
18.	Dhañañjayavyāyoga ..	Kāñcanapaṇḍita	,,	,,
19.	Naiṣadhīyacarita ..	Śrīharṣa	Poem	1150 ,,
20.	Nalavilāsa ..	Rāmacandra	Drama	,,
21.	Nirbhayabhīma ..	,,	,,	,,
22.	Harakelināṭaka ..	Vigraharājadeva Viśāladeva.	,,	,,
23.	Kirātārjunīya ..	Vatsarāja	,,	1200 ,,
24.	Sahṛdayānanda ..	Kṛṣṇānanda	Poem	,,
25.	Bālabhārata ..	Amaracandra	,,	1250 ,,

Serial No.	Name of the work	Author	Type	Date
26.	Pāṇḍavacarita ..	Devaprabhasūri	Poem	1250 A. D.
27.	Bālabhārata ..	Agastya	,,	1300 ,,
28.	Pārthaparākrama ..	Prahlādana	Drama	,,
29.	Bhīmaparākrama ..	Mokṣāditya	,,	,,
30.	Saugandhikāh araṇa ..	Viśvanātha	,,	1350 ,,
31.	Nalābhyudaya ..	Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa	Poem	1400 ,,
32.	Nalodaya	Vāsudeva	,,	1450 ,,
33.	Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya ..	,,	,,	,,
34.	Bhāratacampu ..	Anantabhaṭṭa	Campu	1550 ,,
35.	Bhaimīpariṇaya ..	Śrīnivāsadīkṣita	Drama	,,
36.	Subhadrādhanañjaya ..	Gururāma	,,	1600 ,,
37,	Pāñcālisvayaṁvaracampu	Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa	Campu	,,
38.	Bhāratacampu ..	Rajacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita	,,	1620 ,,
39.	Draupadīpaviṇayacampu	Cakrakavi	,,	1650 ,,
.	Nalacarita.. ..	Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita	Drama	,,
41,	Subhadrāpariṇaya ..	Nallākavi	,,	1700 ,,

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND WORKS

Page

A

Abhayacandra 189
Abhayadeva 86
Abhayanandin 189
Abhidhānacintāmaṇi 194
(Nāmamālā)
Abhidhānaratnamālā 193
Abhidharmakośa 222
Abhijñānaśākuntala 6, 8, 65, 73, 75,
113, 131, 132, 134, 135, 143, 144,
145, 147, 155
Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi
(Mānasollāsa) 103, 210, 213
Abhinanda 74, 83, 115
" 82
Abhinavabhāratī 164, 177
Abhinavagupta 83, 97, 140, 164, 172,
174, 177, 178, 210, 251
Abhinavakālidāsa 115
Abhinayadarpaṇa 209
Abhisamayālaṅkārakārikā 222
Abhisārikāvañcitaka 151
(Abhisārikābandhitaka)
Abhiṣekanāṭaka 141, 143
Acyuta 199
Acyutarāyābhyudaya 88, 169
Acyutaśataka 98
Acyutottara 176
Adbhutabrāhmaṇa 25
Adbhuta darpaṇa 162
Adbhutasāgara 197
Adbhutasītārāmastotra 98
Adhikaraṇasārāvali 245
Adhvaramīmāmsākutūhalavṛtti 236
Āḍhyarāja 106, 107
Adhyātmakhaṇḍadvayavivaraṇa 244
Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa 63
Ādikarmapradīpa 221
Ādipurāṇa 225
Ādityapratāpasiddhānta 196
Advaitamakaranda 242
Advaitasiddhi 239, 242
Advaitavidyāvijaya 245
Āgamaḍambara 163
(Ṣaṇmatanāṭaka)
Āgamaprāmāṇya 244
Agastimata 213
Agastya 87, 113, 160

Page

Agastyasaṁhitā 214
Agnipurāṇa 63, 64, 65, 174, 214
Agniveśagṛhyasūtra 32
Ahirbudhnyasamhitā 243
Ahobala 46
Ahobila 211
Aitareyabrāhmaṇa 9, 25, 26, 100
Aitareyāraṇyaka 25
Aitareyopaniṣad 27, 28, 29
Ajayapāla 193
Ajita 234
Akalaṅka 224
Ākhyātacandrikā 194
Akutobhayā 222
Ālambanaparīkṣā 222
Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi 180, 181
Alaṅkārakarṇābharaṇa 181
Alaṅkārakaustubha 181
Alankārānusāriṇī 180
Alankāraratnākara 181
Alankārasamgraha 180
Alankārasārasamgraha 177
Alankārasarvasva 180
Alankāraśekhara 181
Alankāratilaka 180
Allārāja 180
Allaṭa (Alaka) 179, 180
Āloka 235
Alvārs 244
Amalānanda 241
Amaracandra 86
Amarasimha 39, 70, 139, 193, 194
Amaru (Amaruka) 95, 177
Amaruśataka 95, 96
Amitagati 101, 225
Amoghavṛtti 189
Amṛtakataka 46
Amṛtalaharī 98
Amṛtānanda 76
Amṛtānandayogin 180
Amṛtataraṅgakāvya 83
Amṛtodaya 164
Ānanda 122
Ānandagiri 241
(Ānandajñāna)
Ānandakandacampu 116
Ānandamandākinī 98

Page
Ānandarāghava 161
Ānandarangavijayacampu 117, 169
Ānandarāyamakhin 164
Ānandasāgarastava 98
Ānandasundarī 162
Anandatīrtha 20, 57, 64, 97,
(Madhva) 238, 239
Ānandavardhana 40, 80, 95, 97, 172, 175, 177, 178
Anaṅgaharṣamātrārāja 140, 157
Anaṅgaraṅga 209
Ananta 121
Anantabhaṭṭa 116
Anantaśarman 113
Anargharāghava 132, 157, 158
Anekārthakośa 194
Anekārthaśabdakośa 194
Anekārthasamucccaya 193
Anekārtha saṅgraha 194
Agatvanirukti 234
Angavijjā 197
Anguttaranikāya 221
Aniruddha 231
Annambhaṭṭa 186, 229, 230, 234, 236, 242
Annapūrṇādaśaka 96
Aṇubhāṣya 246
Anubhūtiprakāśa 242
Anubhūtisvarūpācārya 189, 241
Anupadasūtra 33
Anustotrasūtra 33
Anuttarāṣṭikā 251
Anuvākānukramaṇī 34
Anyāpadeśaśataka 102
" 102
Anyāpohavicārakārikā 222
Anyoktimuktālatā 102
Anyoktiśataka 102
Āpadeva 236
Aparārka 202
Aparokṣānubhūti 241
Āpastamba 23, 32, 74, 201
Āpastambagṛhyasūtra 32
Apohanāmaprakaraṇa 222
Apohasiddhi 223
Appayadīkṣita 46, 57, 87, 89, 98, 161, 181, 186, 194, 235, 241, 242, 249
Āptamīmāṃsā 224
Āptaniścayālaṅkāra 223, 224
Arisimha 86
Arjunacaritamahākāvya 177
Arjunamiśra 56
Arṇavarṇana 86
Ārṣānukramaṇī 34
Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa 25, 34

Page
Ārṣeyakalpa 33
(Maśakakalpasūtra)
Arthasamgraha 235
Arthaśāstra 100, 209, 211, 212, 214
Āryabhata 52, 69, 196, 198, 199
Āryabhaṭīya 198, 199
Āryabhaṭīyabhāṣya 199
Āryaka 153
Āryāsaptaśatī 104
Āryasiddhānta 196
Āryaśūra 121, 221
Asanga 220, 222
Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi 139, 154
Āśmakavamśa 176
Āśoka 222
Aṣṭādhyāyī 1, 2, 3, 4, 31, 128, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, 192
Aṣṭamahāśrīcaityastotra 96
Aṣṭāngahṛdaya (samhitā) 207
Aṣṭāṅgasangraha 207
Aṣṭasāhasrikāpāramitā 221
Aśvacikitsā 208
Aśvaghoṣa 4, 70, 71, 72, 76, 79, 91, 96, 121, 150, 163, 221
Āśvalāyana 25, 33
Aśvamedhaparvan 49
Aśvaśāstra 208
Aśvavaidyaka 208
Aśvāyurveda 208
" 208
Aśvinīkumāra 208
Atharvapariśiṣṭa 33
Atharvaveda 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 126, 195, 204
Atharvaveda prātiśākhyasūtra
(Cāturadhyāyikā) 30
Atimānuṣastava 97
Ātmabodha 241
Ātmatattvaviveka 228
(Bauddhadhikkāra)
Ātreyabhāṣyakāra 229
Ātreyaśikṣā 34
Ātreyatantra 228
Aucityavīcāracarcā 83, 179
Avadānakalpalatā 121
(Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā)
Avadānaśataka 82, 120, 121, 128
Avalokiteśvaraguṇakaraṇḍavyūha 221
Avantīsundarī 178
Avantisundarī (kathā) 69, 78, 109, 110, 111, 112, 140, 143, 146, 148, 167, 175, 176
Avantisundarīkathāsāra 109, 110, 148
Avatamsakasūtra 221
Avayavinirākaraṇa 222
Aviddhakarṇa 229
Avimāraka 139, 141, 142
Āyurvedasarvasva 207

Page

B

Bādarāyaṇa 226, 236
Bahudaivatyāgama 249
Bāhudantaka 211
Bāhyārthasiddhikārikā 222
Bālabhārata 86
" 87, 113
" 158
Bālabodhinī 188
Bālacandrasūri 86
Bālacarita 139, 141, 142
Baladeva vidyābhūṣaṇa 248
Bālakrīḍā 202
Bālamanoramā 187, 236
Bālamārtāṇḍavijaya 162
Bālambhaṭṭa (Bālakṛṣṇa) 202
Bālambhaṭṭī 202
Bālarāmabharata 211
Balarāmapañcānana 190
Balarāmāvarman 211
Bālarāmāyaṇa 132, 158
Bālasarasavatī 191
Bālāvabodha 188
Ballālasena 122, 182, 197
Bāṇa 56, 69, 71, 78, 82, 83, 85, 96, 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 119, 122, 137, 143, 146, 152, 153 160 167, 174, 175, 178, 180, 182, 202
Bāṇeśvara vidyālaṅkāra 117
Bhadrabāhu 198, 224
Bhadrakīrti 112
Bhagavadajjuka 150
Bhagavadgītā 8, 54, 58, 147, 237, 239, 241, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248, 251
Bhagavadgītābhāṣya 239, 241
Bhagavadgītārthasangraha 251
Bhagavadgītātātparyanirṇaya 239
Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa 244
Bhagavantabhāskara 203
Bhāgavata 39, 50, 51, 63, 64 72, 98, 115, 116, 141, 243, 244, 246, 248
Bhāgavatacampu 115
" 116
Bhāgavatasandarbha 248
Bhāgavatavyākhyā 239
Bhaimarathī 106
Bhaimīpariṇaya 161
Bhairavānanda 161
Bhaktāmarastotra 96
Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu 248
Bhallaṭa 102
Bhallaṭaśataka 102
Bhāmaha 105 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 190, 192
Bhāmahālaṅkāra (Kāvyālaṅkāra) 165, 175, 176, 177
Bhāmahālaṅkāravivaraṇa 177
Bhāmati 241
Bhāminīvilāsa 101, 102, 181
Bhānudutta 180
Bharadvāja 30, 33, 214
Bharadvājavrtti 228
Bharata 130, 131, 134, 171, 172, 173 177, 180, 209, 210
Bhāratacampu 116
" 116
Bharatapramitakavyādhyāya 115
Bhāratamañjarī 83
Bharatārṇava 209
Bhāratasamhitā 49, 50, 52
Bharatasena 93
Bharatasvāmin 20
Bharataṭīkā 174
Bhāratītīrtha 242
Bhāravi 69, 79, 80, 81, 82, 109, 110, 112, 115, 125, 152, 174
Bhartṛhari 8, 95, 100, 101, 115
" 80, 185, 187, 241
Bhartṛharinirveda 161
Bhartṛmitra 233
Bhartṛprapañca 240, 246. 247
Bhāsa 107, 110, 111, 115, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 152
Bhāṣāpariccheda (Kārikāvalī) 230
Bhāsarvajña 229, 250
Bhāskara 136, 161
" 196
" 198, 199
" 238, 246, 247
" (Laugākṣi) 230, 235
" 252
Bhāskararāya 236
Bhāskarapurāṇa 66
Bhāsvatī 199
Bhāṣyabhāvabodhana 244
Bhāṣyabhāvaprakāśikā 241
Bhāṣyadīpa 234
Bhāṣyaprakāśa 246
Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā 241
Bhāṣyasūkti 230
Bhaṭṭabhāskara 20
Bhaṭṭakaṇa 121
Bhāṭṭācintāmaṇi 236
Bhāṭṭadīpikā 236
Bhaṭṭamalla 194
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa 110, 132, 133, 135, 151, 153, 154, 158, 177
Bhaṭṭanāyaka 173, 174, 178
Bhaṭṭāraharicandra 6, 106, 107
Bhāṭṭarahasya 236
Bhāṭṭasāra 236
Bhaṭṭatauta 177, 178
Bhaṭṭi 80, 90, 176
Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita 186, 190, 203, 235, 242
Bhaṭṭotpala 196, 197

Page
Bhavabhūti 81, 112, 115, 122, 132, 150, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 177, 178

Bhavadāsa 233, 236
Bhavadevabhaṭṭa 234
Bhāvadīpikā 239
Bhāvamiśra 207
Bhāvanāpuruṣottama 164
Bhavanātha 235
Bhāvanāviveka 234
Bhāvaprakāśa 207
Bhāvaprakāśana 134, 180
Bhāvaprakāśikā 239
,, 244, 245

Bhavasvāmin 20
Bhāvivikta 229
Bhaviṣyapurāṇa 63
Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa 63
Bhayabhañjana 197
Bhelasamhitā 207
Bhikṣāṭanakāvya 88
Bhīma (Bhaumaka) 79, 90
Bhīmaṭa 158
Bhīmaparākrāma 160
Bhoganātha 104
Bboja 69, 73, 82, 83, 106, 109, 114, 115, 122, 138, 140, 159, 172, 175, 179, 180, 189, 193, 196, 197, 199, 202, 206, 207, 208, 212, 213, 214, 232, 241, 249

Bhojaprabandha 122, 182
Bhojarājasaccarita 161
Bhṛngadūta 94
Bhṛngasandeśa 94
Bhūdevaśukla 164
Bhūṣaṇa 46
Bhūṣaṇabāṇa 107, 109
Bhuvanābhyudaya 167
Bījagaṇita 199
Bilhaṇa 4, 83, 84, 91, 95, 159, 167 170
Bodhapañcadaśikā 251
Bodhāyana 32, 69, 150, 198, 199, 201, 238

Bodhāyanapitṛmedhasūtra 33
Bodhicaryāvatāra 100, 222
Bodhisattvacaryānirdeśa 222
Brahmā 61
Brahmagupta 198
Brahmānanda 252
Brahmanandin 238
Brahmānandasarasvatī 242
Brāhmaṇasarvasva 202
Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 61, 63
Brahmapurāṇa (Ādipurāṇa) 63, 64
Brahmasiddhi 96, 240, 242

Page
Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta 198
Brahmasūtra (Vedāntasūtra) 226, 233, 237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250
Brahmasūtrabhāṣya 100, 239, 241, 247
Brahmasūtrāṇubhāṣya 239, 246
Brahmasūtrānuvyākhyāna 239
Brahmatattvasamīkṣā 240
Brahmavaivartapurāṇa 63
Bramavidyāvijaya 245
Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara 186
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad 25, 27, 28, 29
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadvārtika 241
Bṛhadbhāgavatāmṛta 248
Bṛhaddeśī 210
Bṛhaddevatā 34, 101
Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa 66
Bṛhadvivāhaphala 197
Bṛhadvṛtti 189
Bṛhajjātaka 197
Bṛhaspati 74, 202
Bṛhaspatismṛti 202
Bṛhatī (Nibandhana) 234, 235
Bṛhatkathā 73, 83, 107, 110, 112, 118, 119, 120, 125, 174

Bṛhatkathāmañjarī 83, 118, 120, 121
Bṛhatsamhitā 51, 192, 197, 213, 214
Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī 34
Bṛhaṭṭīkā 234
Buddhabhaṭṭa 213
Buddhacarita 71, 72, 76, 90, 96
Buddhaghoṣa 79
Buddhavaṁśa 221
Budhabhūṣaṇa 104
Budhasvāmin 119, 120

C

Caitanyacandrodaya 164
Caitanyacaritāmṛta 248
Caitanyāmṛta 190
Cakorasandeśa 94
Cakrakavi 89, 116
Cakrapāṇidatta 207
Camatkāracandrikā 181
Cāṇakya (Kauṭliya) 100, 209, 211, 212
Cāṇakyanīti 212
Cāṇakyaśataka 100
Caṇḍakauśika 159
Caṇḍakavi 86
Caṇḍamāruta 245
Caṇḍeśvara 208
,, 212
,, 213
Caṇḍīśataka 96, 106
Candra 191, 235
Candradūta 94
Candragomin 188
Candrakalānāṭikā 181
Candralekhā 16

Page
Candrāloka 180, 181
Candraprabhacarita 87
Candraprabhasūri 87
Cāndravyākaraṇa 188
Candrayaṇi 214
Candrikā 178
Candrikāvithi 162
Caraka 4, 206
Carakasaṁhitā 204, 206
Caraṇavyūha 33
Cārucaryā 101
,, 202
Cārudatta 140, 141, 142
Cārumati 106
Caturadāmodara 211
Caturdaṇḍiprakāśikā 211
Caturvargacintāmaṇi 203
Caturvargasaṅgraha 101
Catūśśloki 97
Cawrapañcāśikā 95
Chalitarāma 159
Chandassūtra 68, 192
Chāndogyabrāhmaṇa 25
Chāndogyapariśiṣṭa 33
Chāndogyopaniṣad 25, 26, 28, 29, 238
Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya 174
Chandomañjarī 192
Chandonukramaṇī 34
Chandonuśāsana 192
Chandoviciti 100, 192
Chindapraśasti 86
Cidambara 88, 90, 116
Cidānandapaṇḍita 235
Cikitsākalikā 207
Cikitsāmṛta 207
Cikitsāsāra 207
,, 207
Cintāmaṇi 203
Citrabhārata 159
Citracampu 117
Citrādvaitasiddhi 222
Citramīmāṁsā 181
Citramīmāṁsākhaṇḍana 181
Citrapaṭa 235
Citsukha 239, 241, 242

D

Dakṣiṇāmūrtyaṣṭaka 93, 96
Dakṣiṇāvartanātha 71
Dāmaka 150
Damaruka 162
Dāmodaragupta 100, 157
Dāmodaramiśra 159
,, 192
Dānakelikaumudī 161
Daṇḍin 6, 69, 78, 79, 81, 83, 105, 109, 110, 111, 112, 119, 122, 140, 143, 146, 167, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177
Darpadalana 101

Page
Darsanaśuddhi 224
Darśanodaya 252
Daśabhūmiśvara 221
Daśagitikāsūtra 198
Daśakumāracavita 109, 110, 111
Daśarathajātaka 41
Daśarūpa 179
Daśarūpāvaloka 159, 179
Daśaśloki 241, 242
,, 248
Daśavaikālikaniryukti 224
Daśavaikālikasūtra 224
Daśāvatāracarita 83
Dattaka 149, 150, 209
Dattakalaśi 149
Dattātreya 61
Dattila 209
,, 209
Dayāpāla 189
Dāyabhāga 202
Deśīnāmamālā 194
Devānandābhyudaya 89
Devanandin (Pūjyapāda) 224
Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa 203
Devaprabhasūri 87
Devarāja 162
Devarājayajvan 20
Devasvāmin 235, 236
Devasūri 224
Devatādhyāyabrāhmaṇa 25
Devatānukramaṇī 34
Devavimalagaṇi 89
Devendrabodhi 222
Devendrasūri 189
Devībhāgavata 63, 65
Devicandragupta 151
Devīmāhātmya 63
Devīśataka 97, 177
Dhammapāda 100 220
Dhanañjaya 83, 193
,, 119, 172, 179
Dhanañjayavyāyoga 159
Dhanapāla 109, 112, 157, 194, 213
Dhanika 159, 178, 179
Dhanvantarinighaṇṭu 208
Dharmābhyudaya 164
Dharmabindu 224, 225
Dharmadāsa 109, 182
Dharmakīrti 112, 222, 228
,, 186
Dharmākūṭa 46
Dharmaparīkṣā 101, 225
Dharmarājādhvarin 242
Dharmaratna 202
Dharmaśarmābhyudaya 82
Dharmavijayanāṭaka 164

Page
Dharmottara 163, 222
Dhātupāṭha 184, 188, 190
Dhātuvṛtti (Mādhavīyā) 187
Dhoyi 93, 104
Dhṛḍhabala 206
Dhuṇḍīnātha 214
Dhūrtanartaka 162
Dhūrtasamāgama 160
Dhūrtaviṭasamvāda 138, 150
Dhvanyāloka 40, 139, 140, 175, 177, 178
Dhvanyālokalocana 177, 251
Dīdhiti 229
Dinnāga 40, 71, 72, 150, 151, 155.
" 71, 72, 150, 222, 228
Dīpaṅkara 208
Dīpaśikhāpañjikā 234
Dīpavamśa 221
Dīpikā 46
Dīrghāgama 221
Divyaprabandha 244
Divyāvadāna 120
Drāhyāyaṇa 33
Dramiḍācārya 238, 244, 245
Dramiḍopaniṣatsāra 245
Dramiḍopaniṣattātparyaratnāvalī 245
Draupadīpariṇayacampu 116
Dṛṣṭāntaśataka 101
Duhkhabhañjanakavi 192
Durgasimha 188
Durghaṭavṛtti 186
Durlabharāja 197
Durvinīta 119
Dūtaghaṭotkaca 139, 141
Dūtāṅgada 164
Dūtavākya 139, 141
Dvādaśastotra 97
Dvirūpakośa 194
" 194
Dvisandhāna 109, 112, 175
Dvyāśrayakāvya 84, 169
Dyādviveda 101

E

Ekākṣarakośa 194
Ekākṣararatnamālā 194
Ekāvalī 181

G

Gadādhara 229, 230
Gadyacintāmaṇi 112
Gadyatraya 97, 244, 245
Gajavaidya 208
Gaṇa 208
Gaṇakārikā 250
Gaṇapāṭha 184, 187, 188
Gaṇḍavyūha 221
Gandhahastimahābhāṣya 224
Gandharvaprārthanāṣṭaka 98
Gāṇḍīstotragāthā 96
Gaṅgādāsa 192

Page
Gaṅgādāsapratāpavilāsa 161
Gaṅgādevī 87, 109, 160
Gaṅgādhara 161
Gaṅgādhara miśra 234
Gaṅgālaharī (Piyūṣalaharī) 98
Gaṅgāstava 97
Gaṅgāvaṁśānucarita 116
Gaṅgāvataraṇa 89
Gaṅgeśa 229
Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha 198
Garga 214
Gārgīsamhitā 195
Garuḍadaṇḍaka 98
Garuḍapurāṇa 63, 64
Gāthāsaṅgraha 222
Gāthāsaptaśatī (Saptaśatī) 73, 103, 104
Gauḍapāda 231, 240, 241
Gauḍavaho 81, 167
Gauḍorviśakulapraśasti 86
Gautama (Akṣapāda) 201, 226, 227
Ghanaśyāma 162
Ghaṭakarpara 70, 94, 177
Ghaṭakarpara (kāvya) 70, 94
Ghaṭakarparakulakavivṛti 177
Gheraṇḍasamhitā 232
Gītagovinda 93, 95, 97
Gītarthasangraha 239
" 244, 245
Gitārthasangraharakṣā 245
Gobhila 33
Gobhilagṛhyasūtra 32, 33
Gobhilaputra 33
Gokulanātha 161, 164
Gola 199
Goladīpikā 199
Gopālabhaṭṭa 248
Gopālakelikrīḍā 163
Gopathabrāhmaṇa 9, 25, 26
Gopeśvara 246
Gapīnātha cakravartin 163
Gorakṣaśataka 232
Govardhana 93, 104
Govinda 181
Govindabhāṣya 248
Govindābhiṣeka (Śrīcihnakāvya) 84, 97, 190
Govindadīkṣita 88, 89, 161, 210, 211, 234
Govindalīlāmṛta 248
Govindānandasarasvatī 241
Govindarāja 46
Govindasvāmin 20
Goyīcandra 189
Goyīcandrikā 189
Grahacāranibandhana 198
Grahacāranibandhanasangraha 198
Grahagaṇita 199
Grahaṇanirṇaya 199

Page
Gṛhyasangrahapariśiṣṭa 33
Gūḍhārthadīpikā 242
Guhadeva 20, 244
Gumāni 102
Guṇabhadra 225
Guṇacandra 138, 209
Guṇāḍhya 73, 83, 107, 110, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 148, 188
Gupta 153
Gurucandrikā 242
Gurūpasattivijaya 245
Gururāma 161

H

Haimalaghunyāsa 189
Hāla 103
Halāyudha 83, 90, 193, 203
Hammīramadamardana 160
Hammīramahākāvya 87
Hamsadūta 94
Hamsasandeśa 93
„ 94
„ 94
Hanumān 159
Hanumannāṭaka (Mahānāṭaka) 159
Haracaritacintāmaṇi 86
Haradatta 185
„ 250
Haradattasūri 89, 91
Haragaurīvivāha 161, 211
Harakelināṭaka 159
Haramekhala 207
Hārāvalī 194
Haravijaya 82, 90, 97, 157
Haravilāsa 158
Haribhadrasūri 224, 225, 252
Haribhaktivilāsa 248
Haribhāskara 104
Haricandra 82, 182
Haricarita 87
Haridatta 198
Harihara 161, 229
Harikavi 104
Harilīlā 64
Harināmāmṛta 190
„ 190
Haripāla 81
„ 210
Haripaṇḍita 46
Hariprabodha 177
Hariṣeṇa 77, 78, 106
Harisvāmin 20
Hārīta 201
Harivaṁśa 47, 56, 128, 225
Harivijaya 110, 178,
„ 17

Page
Harivilāsa 87
Harṣa (Harṣadeva, Harṣavardhana) 96, 132, 136, 151, 152, 153, 162, 167, 174, 177, 178, 187
Harṣacarita 69,71, 78, 103, 106, 107, 108, 112, 119, 137, 143, 146, 167, 180
Harṣacaritavārtika 180
Harṣakīrtisūri 190, 197
Hastāmalakācārya 241
Hāsyacūḍāmaṇi 160
Hāsyārṇava 162
Haṭhayogapradīpikā 232
Hayagrīvavadha 78
Hemacandra 84, 91, 101, 122, 126, 159, 179, 180, 182, 189, 190, 192, 194, 209, 212, 224, 225
Hemādri 203
Hetucakra 222
Hetukhaṇḍana 229
Hiraṇyakeśī 23
Hīrasaubhāgya 89
Hitopadeśa 4, 123, 125, 126
Horāśāstra 197
Horāṣaṭpañcāśikā 197
Hṛdayadarpaṇa 178

I

Immeḍi Prauḍhadevarāya 209
Indra 188
Indradatta 184
Irugappadaṇḍanātha 194
Iśāvāsyopaniṣad (I opaniṣad) 28, 245
Iśāvāsyopaniṣadbhāṣya 245
Iṣtasiddhi 241
Iśvarabhaṅgakārikā 222
Iśvaradatta 138, 150
Iśvaragītā 65
Iśvarakṛṣṇa 231
Iśvarasamhitā 243
Iśvarapratyabhijñākārikā 251
Iśvarapratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti 251
Iśvarapratyabhijñāsūtra 251
Iśvarasiddhi 251

J

Jagaddeva 197
Jagadīśa 162
„ 229, 230
Jagadūcarita 87
Jagajjyotirmalla 161, 211
Jagannāthapaṇḍita 98, 101, 102, 181
Jaimini 33, 49, 226, 233
Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa 26
Jaiminīyanyāyamālā 191, 235
Jainarājataraṅgiṇī 88
Jalhaṇa 84, 101, 104, 108, 168

Page
Jāmbavatīvijaya 67
Jambhāladatta 121
Jānakīharaṇa 79, 90, 174
Jānakīnātha 230
Jānakīpariṇaya 89, 162
Janāśraya 100, 192
Janāśrayī 100
Jaṭādhara 74
Jātakamālā 121, 221
Jātakas 123, 221
Jaya 49, 50, 51, 52
Jayadatta 208
Jayaddhara 188
Jayadeva 93, 95, 97, 104
„ 132, 160, 180, 181
„ 192
„ 209
„ 229
Jayadevacchandas 192
Jayāditya 185
Jayākyasaṃhitā 243
Jayamangala 209
Jayamiśra 234
Jayantabhaṭṭa 82, 109, 146, 163, 227, 228, 229
Jayantavijaya 86
Jayaratha 86
Jayasimhasūri 160
Jayatīrtha 20, 239
Jayavallabha 104
Jīmūtavāhana 202
Jina 188, 222
Jiṇadāsa 225
Jinasena 93, 225
Jinduka 84
Jinendrabuddhi 185, 189, 222, 224
(Pujyapāda Devanandin)
Jīvadeva 112
Jīvagosvāmin 181, 190, 248
Jīvakacintāmaṇi 113
Jīvānandanam 164
Jīvanmuktiviveka 242
Jñānaśrī 222
Jñānendrasarasvatī 187
Jonarāja 88, 104, 122
Jūmaranandin 189
Jyotiriśvara 160, 209
Jyotirvidābharaṇa 70, 196
Jyotiṣasāroddhāra 197
Jyotiṣavedānga 31

K

Kādambarī 82, 83, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 152, 160 175
Kādambarīkalyāṇa 160
Kādambarīkathāsāra 82
Kahoḍa 117

Page
Kaiyaṭa 186
Kālamādhavīya 203
Kalāpariccheda 175
Kalāvilāsa 101
Kālaviveka 202
Kalhaṇa 84, 88, 91, 168
Kālidāsa 6, 7, 8, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 107, 110, 112, 113, 115, 117, 122, 125, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 157, 159, 167, 173, 177, 178, 182, 192, 193, 196
Kālikāpurāṇa 66
Kalingarāya Sūrya 104, 111
Kaliviḍambana 102
Kallaṭa 250, 251
Kālottarāgama 249
Kalpadru 194
Kalpānupada 33
Kalyāṇamalla 209
Kalyāṇamandirastotra 96
Kalyāṇarakṣita 222
Kalyāṇasaugandhika 163
Kāmadatta 149
Kāmadhenu 190
Kāmakalā 252
Kamalā 162
Kamalākarabhaṭṭa 203, 235
Kamalaśīla 222, 229
Kamalinīkalahamsanāṭaka 161
Kāmandaka 125, 212
Kāmasūtra 77, 78, 90, 150, 182, 208, 209
Kamban 46
Kambarāmāyaṇa 46
Kamsavadha 161
Kamsavaho 89
Kaṇāda 226, 227
Kaṇādarahasya 230
Kāṇajit 197
Kanakadhārāstava 96
Kanakajānakī 159
Kanakalekhākalyāṇa 161
Kanakasenavādirāja 83, 167
Kāñcanapaṇḍita 159
(Kāñcanācārya)
Kandarpacintāmaṇi 209
Kandarpasambhava 160
Kaṇṭha 115
Kapardisvāmin 20
Kapila 226, 231
Kapiṣṭhalakaṭhasaṃhitā 23
Kapphiṇābhyudaya 82, 90
Karanṇāgama 249
Karaṇakutūhala 197

Page
Karaṇottama 199
Karmadhara 188
Karmapradipa 33
Karmapuṇḍarika 221
Karṇabhāra 139, 141
Karṇasundari 159
Karpaṭa 152. 213
Karpūracarita 160
Karpūramañjari 136, 158
Karpūravartikā 235
Karuṇālahari (Viṣṇulahari) 98
Kāryakāraṇabhāvasiddhi 222
Kāśikā 79, 185, 188. 189, 234
Kāsikāvivaraṇapañjikā (Nyāsa)185, 189
Kāśikhaṇḍa 65
Kāśipatikavirāja 161
Kāśyapa 188, 202
Kāśyapasamhitā 198, 207
„ 207
Kaṭandi 158, 228
Kātantravrtiprakāśa 188
Kāṭhakagṛhyasūtra 33
Kāṭhakasaṁhitā 23
Kāthākautuka 122
Kathārṇava 122
Kathāsaritsāgara 73, 110, 118. 119, 120, 121, 125, 184
Kaṭhopaniṣad 28
Kātyāyana 2, 30, 33, 34, 68, 184, 185, 192, 193, 220
Kātyāyanaśrāddhakalpa 33
Kaumudimahotsava 138, 152, 167
Kaumudimitrānanda 159
Kauśikasūtra 33
Kauṣitakibrāhmaṇa (Sānkhyānabrāhmaṇa) 25, 26
Kauṣitakyāraṇyaka 25
Kauṣitakyupaniṣad 27, 28, 29
Kaustubhaprabhā 248
Kautukaratnākara 162
Kautukasarvasva 162
Kavikalpadruma 190
Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa 179, 182
Kavikarṇapūra 164, 181
Kavindravacanasamuccaya 103
Kaviputra 137, 143
Kavirahasya 83, 193
Kavirāja 85, 91, 113, 177
Kavitārkika 162
Kāvyadarpaṇa 181
Kāvyādarśa 2. 67, 78, 79, 83, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 119. 174, 175, 176, 182
Kāvyakautuka 177
Kāvyakautukavivaraṇa 177
Kāvyālaṅkāra 178
Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra with vṛtti 139, 140, 148, 177, 212

Page
Kāvyamimāmsā 119, 138, 178, 182,
Kāvyanirṇaya 179
Kāvyānuśāsana 179, 180
Kāvyapradipa 181
Kāvyaprakāśa 179, 180, 182
Kedārabhaṭṭa 192
Kenopaniṣad 25, 28, 29
Keśavācārya 248
Keśavadaivajña 194
Keśavamiśra 181, 230
Keśavasvāmin 193
Ketana 111
Khādira 33
Khaṇḍadeva 236
Khaṇḍakhādyaka 198
Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya 86, 241, 242
Kheṭayānapradipikā 214
Kicakavadha 81
Kiraṇāvali 228
Kirātārjuniya 79, 80, 90, 152, 174
Kirātārjuniyavyāyoga 160
Kirtikaumudi 116, 169
Kodaṇḍamaṇḍana 211
Kohala 210
Kokasandeśa 94
Kokilasandeśa 94, 161
Kokkoka 209
Koṇḍubhaṭṭa 186
Kramadiśvara 189
Kratusaṅgraha 33
Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa 182
Kṛṣṇābhyudaya 163
Kṛṣṇacaitanya 94, 98, 104, 161, 190, 229, 238, 246, 248
Kṛṣṇacandra 246
Kṛṣṇacarita 113
Kṛṣṇadāsakavirāja 248
Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta 97
Kṛṣṇakavi 117
Kṛṣṇalilāśuka (Bilvamangala) 84, 91, 97, 190
Kṛṣṇalilātaraṅgiṇi 98
Kṛṣṇamiśra 163
„ 163
Kṛṣṇānanda 86
„ 229, 252
Kṛṣṇatātācārya 236
Kṛṣṇāvadhūta Ghaṭikāśatakavi 163
Kṛṣṇavilāsa 88
Kṛtakoṭi 238
Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi 222, 223
Kṣatracūḍāmaṇi 113
Kṣemaṅkara 121
Kṣemarāja 251
Kṣemendra 82, 83, 110, 119, 120, 121, 159, 173, 179, 182, 192

Page
Kṣemīśvara 159
Kṣīrasamudravāsimiśra 234
Kṣīrasvāmin 187
Kulaśekhara 97
Kulaśekhara Alvār 97
Kulaśekharavarman 138, 157
Kullūkabhaṭṭa 202
Kumāra 115
Kumāradāsa 69, 79, 80, 110, 115, 174
Kumāralabdha 220
Kumāralāta 121, 221
Kumārasambhava 177
„ 6, 69. 70, 71, 72 74, 75, 76, 117, 147, 195
Kumārasambhavacampū 117
Kumārilabhaṭṭa 56, 100, 154, 233 234, 235
Kumbhakarṇa 210
Kumudvatīprakaraṇa 149
Kundamālā 40, 150, 151, 155
Kuntaka (Kuntala) 173, 178
Kunteśvaradautya 73, 143, 167
Kūrmapurāṇa 63, 64, 65
Kusumadeva 101
Kuṭṭinīmata 100, 157
Kuvalayānanda 181, 194,
Kuvalayāśvacarita 180

L

Laghīyastraya 224
Laghubhāgavatāmṛta 248
Laghubhāskarīyā 197
Laghucandrikā 242
Laghujātaka 197
Laghumañjūṣā 186
Laghuśabdenduśekhara 186
Laghusiddhāntakaumudī 186
Laghvarhannīti 212
Laghvī (Vivaraṇa) 234, 235
Lakṣaṇāvali 228
Lakṣaṇamālā 115, 229
Lakṣmaṇasena 197
Lakṣmīdhara 191, 202, 242
Lakṣmīlaharī 98
Lakṣmīnṛsimhastotra 96
Lakṣmīsahasra 98
Lakulīśa 249, 250
Lalitamādhava 161
Lalitātriśatībhāṣya 252
Lalitavigrahanāṭaka 159
Lalitavistara (Vaipulyasūtra) 221
Lalla 194
Laṅkāvatārasūtra 221
Lakñkeśvara (Rāvaṇa) 191
Laṭakamelaka 159
Likhita 201
Līlavatī 162

Page
Līlavatī 199
„ 228
Liṅgānuśāsana 193
„ 185
„ 186
„ 187
„ 188
Liṅgānuśāsanavṛtti 186
Liṅgapurāṇa 63, 65
Lokanāthabhaṭṭa 163
Lolambarāja 87, 207
Lollaṭa 173, 174
Loṣṭadeva 84

M

Madālasācampu 114
Madana 160
Madanagopālavilāsa 161
Madanaketucarita 162
Madanapāla 208
Madanapārijāta 203
Madanasañjīvana 162
Madanavinodanighaṇṭu 208
Mādhava (Mādhavārya) 20
„ 163
„ (ācārya) 65 187, 194, 202, 203 208, 210, 219, 235, 242, 249, 252
Mādhavabhaṭṭa 20
Mādhavakara 207
Mādhavānalakathā 122
Madhumathavijaya 81
Madhusūdana 159
Madhusūdanasarasvatī 98, 239, 242
Madhyamaṭīkā 234
Madhyamāgama 221
Madhyamavyāyoga 139, 141
Mādhyamikasūtras 222
Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī 186
Māgha 80, 81, 82, 112, 115 122, 125 158, 177
Mahābhārata 18, 21, 35 36, 37, 39, 42, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 71, 83, 86, 91, 100, 116, 123, 141, 144, 153, 159, 171, 192, 201, 202, 211, 225 237, 238, 243
Mahābhāraattātparyanirṇaya 57, 239
Mahābhāratatātparyasaṅgraha 57, 249
Mahābhāskarīyā 198
Mahābhāṣya 2, 3, 18, 31, 74, 105, 106, 112, 123, 128, 185, 186, 209, 226, 232

Page
Mahābhāṣyadīpikā 185
Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota 186
Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyotana 186
Mahācārya 245
Mahādeva 162
Mahādeva Vedāntin 194
Mahānāman 69
Mahānārāyaṇīyopaniṣad 28
Mahānāṭaka 158
" 159
Mahāpuruṣanirṇaya 244
Mahāvastu 221
Mahāvidyāviḍambana 230
Mahāvīracarita 154, 155 156, 157, 158, 160
Mahāvīrācārya 198
Mahāvrata 235
Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda 221
Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkārasūtra 222
Mahendravarman 135, 138, 150, 167
Maheśvara 122, 153
" 193,
" 194,
"
Maheśvaratīrtha 46
Mahīdāsa (Mahīdhara) 20
Mahimabhaṭṭa 83, 153, 178, 180
Mahimnastava 97
Mahodadhi 235
Mahopadeśaviṃśatikā 251
Māhuka 207
Maitreyanātha 220, 222
Maitrāyaṇīsamhitā 23
Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad 28, 29
Mālajit (Vedāngarāya) 199
Mālatīmādhava 132, 133, 134, 135, 154, 155. 156, 157, 161
Mālavikāgnimitra 73, 127, 128, 132, 133, 137, 140, 143, 144, 145, 152, 158, 167
Mālinīvijayavārtika 251
Mallikāmāruta 161
Mallinātha 71, 80, 93,
Malliṣeṇa 224
Mammaṭa 179, 180, 182,
Mānamanohara 229
Mānameyodaya 252
Mānameyodayarahasyaślokavārtika 252
Mānaśāra 213
Mānatuṅga 96
Mānavaśrāddhakalpa 33

Page
Mānayāthātmyanirṇaya 244
Maṇḍana 190
" 213
Maṇḍanabhāṣya 190
Maṇḍanamiśra 96, 188, 234, 235, 240, 241
Mandāramarandacampu 117
Māṇḍkūyakārikā 240
Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad 28, 29, 240
Mangala 178
Maṇika 161
Maṇikaṇṭha 230
Māṇikyanandin 224
Manjīra 163, 178
Manjūṣā 186
Mankha (Mankhaka) 84, 90, 158, 168, 180, 182, 194
Manmathonmathana 162
Manodūta 94
" 94
Manoramā 190
Manoramāvatsarāja 158
Manovatī 106, 110
Mantrabhāṣya 20
Mantrabrāhmaṇa 32
Mantrapāṭha 32
Mantrarahasyādhyāya 34
Manu 74
Manusmṛti 8, 22, 32, 71, 200, 202
Mārkaṇḍeya 191
Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa 63
Mātanga 210
Mātangadivākara 152
Mātangalīlā 208
Māṭhara 231
Mathurādāsa 162
Mathurāvijaya 87, 160, 169
Mātṛgupta 174, 178
Matsyapurāṇa 51, 61, 63, 65, 144
Mattavilāsaprahasana 135, 138, 139, 140, 152, 167, 213
Mayamata 21
Mayūkhamālikā 235
Mayukhāvali 235
Mayūra 96, 110, 115, 152, 182
Māyurāja 103, 115, 157, 178
Mayūrasandeśa 94
Medhātithi 202
Medhāvin 176
Medhāvi Rudra 173, 174, 176
Medinīkara 194
Meghanādāri 244
Meghaprabhācārya 164
Meghapratisandeśa 94

Page
Meghasandeśa 69, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 92, 94
Meghavijayagaṇi 89, 91, 125, 189
Meṇṭha 7, 78, 82, 115
Merutunga 182
Milhaṇa 207
Mīmāmsākaustubha 236
Mīmāmsāmakaranda 235
Mīmāmsānyāyaprakāśa 236
Mīmāmsāpādukā 245
Mīmāmsāsūtra 226, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 245
Mīmāmsāsūtrabhāṣya 235
Mīmāmsāsūtrabhāṣyapariśiṣṭa 235
Mīmāmsāsūtrānukramaṇikā 234
Mīnarājayavanācārya 196
Mitākṣarā 202, 242
Mitramiśra 116, 203
Mohamudgara 100
Mohaparājaya 163
Mokṣāditya 160
Mṛcchakaṭika 131, 134, 135, 139, 140, 141, 142, 148, 149, 150, 213
Mṛgāṅkalekhanāṭikā 162
Mṛgendrāgama 249
Muditamadālasā 161
Mudrārākṣasa 113, 132, 134, 151, 152
Mudrārākṣapūrvasaṅkathānaka 113
Mudritakumudacandra 168
Mugdhabodha 190
Mugdhopadeśa 101
Mūka 97
Mūkapañcaśatī 97
Mukundamālā 97
Mukundamuktāvalī 98
Mukundānanda 161
Mukuṭatāḍitaka 106, 153
Mūlabhāvaprakāśikā 244
Mūladeva 110
Muṇḍakopaniṣad 9, 28
Murāri 84, 132, 157, 158
Murārimiśra 234
Muttusvāmidīkṣita 98

N

Nāgānanda 130, 132, 139, 152, 153
Nāgārjuna 207, 214, 220, 222
Nāgeśabhaṭṭa 186, 187
Naiṣadhānanda 159
Naiṣadhīyacarita 85, 86, 89, 194, 241
Nāiṣkarmyasiddhi 241, 242
Nakula 208

Page
Nalābhudaya 88, 113
Nalacampu 114
Nalacarita 162
Nalavilāsa 159
Nallākavi 162
Nalodaya 88
Nāmalingānuśāsana 39, 70, 139, 193, 194
Nāmamālā 193
,, 193
Nāmamālikā 193
Nāmasangrahamālā 194
Nammālvār 245
Nānārtharatnamālā 193 194
Nānārthārṇavasamkṣepa 193
Nānārthaśabdaratna 193
Nandikeśvara (Nandī) 209
Nandīśvara 235
Nañjarājayaśobhūṣaṇa 182
Nānyadeva 210
Nārada 210
Nāradapurāṇa 63, 64
Nāradaśikṣā 30
Nāradasmṛti 202
Nāradasūtra 243
Narahari 197, 208
Naraharijayacaryāsvarodaya 197
Narasimha 160, 163
Narasimhapurāṇa 65, 66
Narasimharājavijaya 181
Nārāyaṇa 110, 115
,, 125
,, 208
,, 213
,, 214
Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa 98, 116, 186, 234, 252
Nārāyaṇārya 245
Nārāyaṇatīrtha 98
Nārāyaṇavilāsa 161
Nārayaṇīya 98, 116, 186, 234
Narendra 189
Nartananirṇaya 210
Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa 182
Nāṭakamīmāmsā 180
Nāthamuni 244
Nāṭyadarpaṇa 138, 139, 209
Nāṭyārṇava 209
Nāṭyaśāstra 65, 127, 129, 131, 134, 171, 173, 174, 177, 178, 209, 210
Nāṭyaveda 127
Nāṭyavedāgama 209
Nāṭyavedavivṛti 140
Navagrahacarita 162
Navamālikā 162
Nāvanītaka 207
Navaratnaparīkṣā 213

Page
Navasāhasāṅkacarita 83, 167
" 86
Nayacandra 87
Nayadyumaṇī 244
Nāyakaratna 235
Nayamaṇimālā 249
Nayamañjarī 242
Nayamayūkhamālikā 245
Nayaprakāśikā 244
Nayaviveka 235
Nemidūta 93
Neminātha 208
Neminirvāṇa 84
Nibandhana 234
Nicula 193
Nidānasūtra 31, 33, 192
Nighaṇṭusamaya 193
Nighaṇṭuśeṣa 193
Nikṣeparakṣā 245
Nīlakaṇṭha 56
" 163
" 197
" 203
Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita 89, 98, 102, 116, 117, 162
Nīlakaṇṭhasomayājin 199
Nīlakaṇṭhavijayacampu 66, 168
Nimbārka 238, 246, 247, 248
Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti 187
Nirbhayabhīma 159
Nirṇayasindhu 203, 235
Nirukta 20, 31, 193, 202
Nītidviṣaṣṭikā 100
Nītimālā 245
Nītimañjarī 101
Nītiprakāśikā 212
Nītiratnākara 212
Nitisāra 125, 212
Nītiśataka 100, 101
Nītitattvāvirbhāva 235
Nitivākyāmṛta 212
Nītivarman 82
Nitya 244
Nṛpatuṅga 80
Nṛsiṃhakvi 181
Nṛsiṃhāśrama 242
Nṛsiṃhavṛttamālā 192
Nyāsa 188
Nyāsakāra 176
Nyāyabhāṣya 228
Nyāyabhūṣaṇa 229
Nyāyabindu 222
Nyāyabinduṭīkā 222
Nyāyakalāpasaṅgraha 244
Nyāyakalikā 229
Nyāyakandalī 224, 228
Nyāyakaṇikā 234

Page
Nyāyakhaṇḍakhādya 225
Nyāyakuliśa 244
Nyāyakumudacandrodaya 224
Nyāyakusumāñjali 228
Nyāyalīlāvatī 229
Nyāyamañjarī 109, 147, 228, 231
" 229
Nyāyāmṛta 239, 242
Nyāyāmṛtataraṅgiṇī 225, 239, 242
Nyāyamuktāvalī 239
Nyāyanirṇaya 241
Nyāyapadma 235
Nyāyapariśiṣṭa (Bodhasiddhi) 228
Nyāyapariśuddhi 245
Nyāyapradīpa 225
Nyāyapraveśa 222
Nyāyarahasya 225
Nyāyarakṣāmaṇi 242
Nyāyaratna 230
Nyāyaratnākara 234
Nyāyaratnamālā 235
Nyāyasaṅgraha 241
Nyāyasāra 229, 250
Nyāyasiddhāntadīpa 229
Nyāyasiddhāñjana 242, 245
Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī 230
Nyāyasūcīnibandha 228
Nyāyasudarśana 244
Nyāyasudhā (Rāṇaka) 234. 235, 236
" 239,
Nyāyasūtra 226, 227, 228, 230
Nyāyasūtravṛtti 230
Nyāyatattva 244
Nyāyavārtika 228
Nyāyāvatāra 224
Nyāyāvatāravivṛti 224
Nyāyaviniścaya 224

O

Oḍayadeva (Vādībhasiṃha) 112, 113

P

Pācakakevalī 197
Padamañjarī 185
Padānukramaṇī 34
Padārthadharmasaṅgraha (Praśastapādabhāṣya) 228, 230
Padārthatattvanirūpaṇa 230
Pādatāḍitaka 153
Padmagupta (Parimala) 69, 83, 91, 167
Padmanābhabhaṭṭa 190
Padmapāda 241
Padmaprābhṛtaka 138. 148, 149
Padmapurāṇa 63, 64, 65, 144
" 225

Page
Pādmasamhitā 243
Pādukāsahasra 98
Padyacūḍamaṇi 79
Padyakādambarī 83
Padyāmṛtataranginī 104
Padyāvalī 104
Paila 49
Paitāmahasiddhānta 195
Paiṭhīnasī 202
Paiyālacchī 194
Pālakāpya 208
Pālyakīrti 178
Pañcadaṇḍacchatraprabandha 121
Pañcadaśī 213
" 242
Pañcākhyānaka 125
Pañcākhyānoddhāra 125
Pāñcālīsvayamvaracampu 116
Pañcapādikā 241
Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa 241
Pañcaprakriyā 241
Pañcarātra 141, 142
Pāñcarātrarakṣā 245
Pañcasāyaka 209
Pañcasiddhāntikā 196
Pañcaśikha 106, 148
Pañcastava 97
Pañcatantra 4, 123, 124, 125, 126, 143,
Pañcavastu 189
Pañcavidhasūtra 30
Pañcavimśabrāhmaṇa (Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa, Prauḍhabrāhmaṇa) 25, 26
Pañcikā 239
Pañcīkaraṇavārtika 241
Pāṇḍavābhyudaya 164
Pāṇḍavacarita 87
Pāṇḍavānanda 159
Pāṇḍavapurāṇa 225
Pāṇini 1, 2, 31, 67, 68, 74, 110, 128, 137, 139, 148, 149, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191
Pāṇinivādanakṣatramālā 186
Pāṇinīyaśikṣā 30, 33
Pañjika 224
Paralokasiddhi 222
Paramalaghumañjūṣā 186
Paramārtha 222, 231
Paramārthacarcā 251
Paramārthadvādaśikā 251
Pramārthasaptati 222
Paramārthasāra 251
Parameśvara 199
Parameśvarabhaṭṭa 87, 94
Pārameśvarasamhitā 243
Pasāśara 60, 61

Page
Parāśarabhaṭṭa 97, 244
Parāśaramādhavīya 202
Parāśarapurāṇa 66
Parāśarasmṛti 202
Paraśarasūtras 198
Pārāśaryavijaya 245
Pāraśava 153
Pāraskara 33
Paraśurama 252
Paraśurāmakalpasūtra 252
Parātrimśikāvivaraṇa 251
Paribhāṣā 189
Paribhāṣenduśekhara 186
Pārijātaharaṇa 85
Pārijātaharaṇacampu 116
Pārijātamañjarī (Vijayaśrī) 160
Parikaravijaya 245
Parīkṣāmukhasūtra 224
Parimala 239, 241
Pariśiṣṭaparvan 126, 225
Paritoṣamiśra 234
Pārsīprakāśa 194, 199
" 194
Pārśvābhudaya 93
Pārśvadeva 210
Paryantapañcadaśikā 251
Pārthaparākrama 160
Pārthasāratkimiśra 234, 235
Pārvatīpariṇaya 161
Pātālavijaya 67
Pātañjalabhāṣyavārtika 232
Patañjali 2, 30, 74, 89, 105, 106, 112, 123, 128, 182, 185, 187, 206, 208, 226, 232
Patañjalicarita 89
Pathyāpathyanighaṇṭu 208
Paṭṭāvali 66
Pauṣkarāgama 249
Pauṣkarasamhitā 243
Pauṣkarasādin 195
Pavanadūta 93
Peddibhaṭṭa 104
Phalaikatvavāda 236
Phalghuhastinī 177
Phiṭsūtra 187
Pingala 68, 192
Potayārya 104
Prabandhacintāmaṇi 182
Prabhacandra 224
Prabhākara 84, 233, 234, 235, 236
Prabhākaravijaya 235
Prabhāvakacarita 87, 169
Prabhāvalī 181
Prabodhacandrikā 190
Prabodhacandrodaya 163, 169

Page
Prabuddharauhiṇeya 160
Pradyumnābhyudaya 160
Pradyumnānanda 162
Prahlādana 160
Prajñākara 222
Prajñāpāramita 221
Prajñāparitrāṇa 221, 244
Prājyabhaṭṭa 88
Prakaraṇapañcikā 235
Prakāśa 235
,, 235
Prakāśātman 241
Prakaṭrrthavivaraṇa 241
Prakīrṇakavivaraṇa 251
Prakriyākaumudī 186, 188, 189
Prakriyāsaṅgraha 189
Prakriyāsarvasva 186
Prākṛtacchandassūtra 192
Prākṛtakalpataru 191
Prākṛtakāmadhenu 191
Prākṛtalakṣaṇa 191
Prākṛtaprakāśa 70, 176, 190
Prākṛtaprakāśavṛtti 190
Prākṛtarūpāvatāra 190, 191
Prākṛtaśabdānuśāsana 190
Prākṛtasarvasva 191
Prākṛtasūtra 190
,, 190
Prākṛtasūtravṛtti 190
Prākṛtavyākaraṇasūtra 191
Pramāṇalakṣaṇa 239 241
Pramāṇamañjarī 230
Pramāṇamīmāmsā 224
Pramāṇanayatattvālokālaṅkāra 224
Pramāṇapaddhati 239
Pramāṇaparīkṣā 222
Pramāṇasamuccaya 222
Pramāṇavārtika 222
Pramāṇavārtikālaṅkāra 222
Pramāṇavidhvamsana 222
Pramāṇaviniścaya 222
Pramāṇaviniścayaṭīkā 222,
,, 222
Prameyadīpikā 239
Prameyakamalamārtāṇḍa 224
Prameyamālā 244
Prameyaratnakośa 224
Prameyasaṅgraha 244
Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍana 239
Prapañcamithyātvakhaṇḍanapañcikā 239
Prapañcasāra 241
Prapannapārijāta 244
Prāsādamaṇḍana 213
Prasangaratnāvalī 104
Prasannarāghava 132, 160
Praśastamati 229
Praśastapāda 228

Page
Praśnamālā 182
Praśnopaniṣad 28, 29
Praśnottararatnamālikā 241
Praśnottaropāsakācāra 225
Prasthānabheda 242
Pratāparudradeva 203
Pratāparudrīyakalyāṇa 160
Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūṣaṇa 131, 136, 146, 160, 181
Pratibhācāṇakya 158
Pratīhārendurāja 177
Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa 141, 142
Pratimānāṭaka 139, 141, 142
Pratimokṣasūtra 221
Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya 222
Prauḍhamanoramā 186
Pravarasena 78, 91, 103, 107, 110, 112
Prāyaṣcittasūtra 33
Premābhirāma 136
Premavilāsa 248
Prince of Kotilingapura 162
Priyadarśikā 152, 153
Pṛthuyaśas 197
Pṛthvīrājavijaya 86, 143, 169
Puṇḍarīkaviṭṭhala 210
Puṇyānanda 252
Purāṇasamhitā 60, 61
Purandara 219
Pūrnabhadra 125
Pūrṇasarasvatī 93, 94
Puruṣaparīkṣā 122
Puruṣottama 246
Puruṣottamadeva 194
,, 194
Puṣpabāṇavilāsa 7, 94
Puṣpadanta 97
Puṣpadūṣitaka 135, 159
Puṣpasūtra 30, 185
Putramārtāṇḍa 212

R

Rādhakāntadeva 194
Rāgamālā 210
Rāgamañjarī 210
Rāgavibodha 211
Rāghavanaiṣadhīya 89
Rāghavapāṇḍavayādavīya 88, 116
Rāghavapāṇḍavīya 85
,, 83, 193
Rāghavendrayati 239
Raghunandana 203, 229
Raghunāthabhūpavijaya (Sāhityaratnākara) 89
Raghunāthābhyudaya 88
,, 89, 169
Raghunāthacarita 113
Raghunāthaśiromaṇi 229, 230

Page
Raghunāthavijayacampu 117
Raghunāthavilāsa 161
Raghuvamśa 6, 65, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 86, 113, 147
Raghuvilāsamahākāvya 180
Raghvīragadya 98
Rahasyarakṣā 245
Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita 89, 116, 161, 181, 235, 236
Rājamārtāṇḍa 197
,, 206
,, 232
,, 241
Rājamitra 176
Rājamṛgāṅka 199
,, 207
Rājan 231
Rājanātha II 88
,, III 88
Rājanighaṇṭu 208
Rājanītisamuccaya 100
Rājaśekhara 79, 80, 84, 103, 112, 115, 119, 132, 136, 138, 139, 143, 157, 158, 159, 162, 174, 178
Rājaśekharasūri 224
Rājataraṅgiṇī 82, 84, 88, 168, 169
Rājavalīpatākā 88
Rākṣasakāvya 94
Rāma 46
,, 162
Rāmabāṇastava 98
Rāmabhadradīkṣita 89, 98, 162
Ramabhdrāmbā 89
Rāmabhadramuni 160
Rāmabhujaṅgastotra 96
Rāmabhyudaya 154, 164
Rāmacandra 88, 90,
,, 138, 159, 209
,, 186
Rāmacandrāśrama 190
Rāmacarita 74, 83
Rāmakaṇṭha 89
Rāmakṛṣṇa 163
Rāmalarahasya 197
Rāmāmātya 210
Rāmānuja 64, 97, 193 214, 245, 247, 249
,, (Ātreya) 244
Rāmānujācārya 116
,, 235, 236
Rāmapālacarita 84, 168

Page
Rāmapāṇivāda 89, 91, 162, 190
Rāmārāma 94
Rāmaśarman 176
Rāmaśāstrin 94
Rāmatarkavāgīśa 190, 191
Rāmatīrtha (Rāmācārya) 239, 242
Rāmavarman 162
Rāmavarmaparīkṣit 89
Rāmavarmayaśobhūṣaṇa 182
Rāmāyaṇa 18, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 67, 76, 78 83, 93, 98, 128, 141, 150, 151, 154, 155, 159, 190, 205, 211
Rāmāyaṇacampu 44, 114, 115
Rāmāyaṇamañjarī 83
Rāmāyaṇatātparya saṅgraha 46, 249
Rāmāyaṇatattvadīpika 46
Rām Carit Manas 46
Rāmila 106 143, 148
Rāṇakabhāvanākārikāvivaraṇa 236
Rāṇakojjvanī 234
Ranganātha 144
Rangarāmānuja (muni) 244. 245
Rasagangādhara 181
Rasahṛdayā 208
Rasakalikā 179
Rasamañjarī 180
Rasaratnākara 207, 208
Rasaratnapradīpikā 180
Rasaratnasamuccaya 207, 214
Rasārṇava 208, 214
Rasārṇavasudhākara 180
Rasasadanabhāṇa 162
Rasataraṅgiṇī 180
Rasavatī 189
Raśigolasphuṭānīti 199
Rasikarañjana 88
Raśmi 246
Rāṣṭrauḍhavamśamahākāya 88
Ratimañjarī 209
Ratirahasya 209
Ratiratnapradīpikā 209
Ratnadīpikā 213
Ratnāharaṇa 176
Ratnākara 82, 90, 97, 157
Ratnakīrti 222
Ratnakośakāra 229
Ratnaparīkṣā 213
Ratnatrayaparīkṣā 249
Ratnāvalī 136, 152, 158, 162

Page
Ratneśvaraprasādana 161
Rāvaṇa 158, 228
Rāvaṇabhāṣya 228
Rāvaṇārjunīya (Arjunarāvaṇīya) 79
Rāvaṇavadha (Bhaṭṭikāvya) 80, 176
Ravigupta 222
Ravipati 136
Raviṣeṇa 225
Ravivarman 160
Rāyabhaṭṭa 96
Ṛgarthadīpikā 20
Ṛgbhāṣya 31, 239
Ṛgveda 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 41, 100, 101, 127, 144, 204,
Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya 30
Ṛgvedasamhitā 23
Ṛgvidhāna 34
Ṛjuvimalapañcikā 235
Ṛkprātiśākhya 192
Romaharṣaṇa 61
Ṛtusamhāra 94
Rucidatta 229
Rudrabhaṭṭa 125, 179
Rudradāman 77, 78, 106
Rudradāsa 162
Rudrakavi 88
Rudraṭa (Śatānanda) 178, 179
Rugviniścaya 207
Rukmiṇīharaṇa 136, 160
Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa 89
Rukmiṇīpariṇaya 162
" 162
Rukmiṇīsvayamvara 89
Rūpagosvāmin 94, 98, 104, 161, 181, 190
Rūpamālā 186
Rūpasiddhi 189
Rūpāvatāra 186
Ruyyaka (Rucaka) 84, 180

S

Śabarasvāmin 187, 233, 234, 235
Śabdabhedaprakāśa 194
Śabdacandrikā 189
" 194
Śabdakalpadruma 194
Śabdakaustubha 186
Śabdānuśāsana 189, 190
" 189
Śabdapradīpa 208
Śabdaratnākara 194
Śabdārṇava 193
abdaśaktiprakāśikī 230

Page
Śabdavyāpāravicāra 180
Śabhārañjanaśataka 102
Saccaritrarakṣā 245
Sadānanda 242
Sadarthasamkṣepa 244
Sadāśiva 211
Sadāśivamakhin 182
Sadbhāṣācandrikā 119, 191
Sadbhāṣāvivaraṇa 191
Saḍdarśanasamuccaya 224, 252
Saddharmapuṇḍarīka 221
Sadguruśiṣya 20, 68
Sadrāgacandrikā 210
Saduktikarṇāmṛta 104
Sadvidyāvijaya 245
Saḍvimśabrāhmaṇa 25
Sāgaranandin 138, 182
Sāhityacintāmaṇi 181
Sāhityadarpaṇa 138, 180
Sāhityakaumudī 181
Sāhityamīmāmsā 180
Sahṛdayalīlā 180
Sahṛdayānanda 86
Śailālin 61
Sakalakīrti 104
Śākaṭāyana 225
Śakhavardhana 189
Śāktānandataraṅgiṇī 176
Śaktibhadra 252
Śaktisūtra 154
Śaktivāda 252
Śākyabodhi 230
Śālihotra 222
Śālikanātha 206
Śālivāhanakathā 234
Sāluvābhyudaya 121
Samādhirāja 88
Samantabhadra 221
Sāmānyadūṣaṇadikprasāritā 224
Sāmaprātiśākhya 222
Samarāditya 30
Sāmarājadīkṣita 112
Sāmarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra 162
Samarapuṅgavadīkṣita 213, 214
Samaṭa 116
235
Sāmaveda 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 33, 34, 127, 209
Sāmavedasamhitā 24, 26
Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa 25
Samayamātṛkā 101
Sambandhaparīkṣā 222
Sāmbapurāṇa 66
Śāmbhavya 33

Page
Śambhu 102
” 104
Śambhudeva 249
Saṅ kṣepaśaṅkaravijaya 174
Samkṣepaśārīraka 241
Samkṣiptasāra 189
Sammatitarkasūtra 224
Sāmśapāyana 61
Samsārāvarta 193
Samudramathana 136, 160
Sāmudrikatilaka 197
Sanātanagosvāmin 248
Sānātani 229
Sanatkumāravāstuśāstra 213
Sandhyākaranandin 84, 168
Śāṇḍilyasūtra 243
Śaṅkha 201
Sanghabhadra 220
Sangatimālā 244
Sangītacintāmaṇi 210
Sangītadāmodara 211
Sangītadarpaṇa 211
Sangītamakaranda 210
Sangītapārijāta 211
Sangītarāja 210
Sangītaratnākara 209, 210

Sangītasamayasāra 210
Sangītasāra 210
Sangītasārasañgraha 211
Sangītasudhā 210
Sangītasudhākara 210
Sangraha 185
Sankalpasūryodaya 164
Śankara 55, 64, 95, 96, 100, 154, 163
174, 234, 238, 241, 242, 246
247, 249, 252
Śankarabhaṭṭa 235
Śankarānanda 222
Śankaramiśra 214, z230
Śankarasvāmin 222, 229
Śankhadhara Kavirāja 159
Sānkhyakārikā 222, z231
Sānkhyapravacanabhāṣya 231
Sānkhyasāra 231
Sānkhyasūtra 231
Sānkhyasūtravṛtti 231
Śānkhyāyana 33
Śānkhyāyanaśrautasutra 192
Śankuka 167, 173, 174, 178
Saṇmukhakalpa 213
Santānāntarasiddhi 222
Śāntanavācārya 187
Śantanu 187
Śāntarakṣita 176, 222, 252
Śāntideva 100, 222

Page
Śāntināthacarita 89
Śāntiśātaka 101
Śāntivilāsa 102
Saptadaśabhūmiśāstrayogācārya 222
Saptapadārthī 229
Saptasandhānamahākāvya 89
Śāradātanaya 134, 138, 139, 140, 172
180
Śāradātilaka 163
Śāraṇa 93
Śaraṇadeva 186
Śaraṇāgatigadya 9
Sārasaṅgraha 22
Sārasvataprakriyā 19
Sarasvatīhṛdayālaṅkārahāra 210
Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa 179
” 189
Sarasvatīvilāsa 203
Śaravarman 118, 188
(Sarvavarman)
Śārīrakaśāstrārthadīpikā 245
Sārīputraprakaraṇa 150
(Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa)
Śarkarīkā 234
Śārngadatta 211
Śārngadeva 210
Śārngadhara 104
” 211
” 214
Śārngadharapaddhati 104, 175
Śārngadharasamhitā 207
Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha 208, 219, 249
252
Sarvadeva 230
Sarvadevavilāsa 117, 169
Sarvajñamitra 96
Sarvajñanārāyaṇa 56
Sarvajñasiddhikārikā 222
Sarvajñātman 241
Sarvamatasaṅgraha 252
Sarvānanda 87, 139
Sarvānukramaṇī 34
Sarvānukramaṇīṭīkā 68
Sarvārthasiddhi 225
” 244
Sarvasena 110, 178
Sarvasiddhāntasangraha 252
Sarvavinodanāṭaka 163
Śaśadhara 229
Śaśivamśamahākāvya 83
Saṣṭitantra 231
Śāstradarpaṇa 242
Śāstradīpikā 235
Śāśvata 193
Śatadūṣaṇī 245

Page

Śātakarṇīharaṇa 106
Śatānanda 199
Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 25, 26, z194
Śatasāhasrikāpāramitā 221
Śataśśokī 207
Sātavāhana 73, 103 107
Sāttvatasamhitā 243
Satyahariścandra 159
Satyāṣāḍha 32
Saugandhikāharaṇa 135, 160
Saumilla 137 143
Śaunaka 30, 33, 34, 214
Saundarananda 72, 76, 90, 96
Saundaryalaharī 96, 252
Saupadmapañjikā 190
Saupadmavyākaraṇa 190
Saurabhāgama 249
Saurapurāṇa 64
Śaurikathā 88
Sauti 49, 50, 52, 56
Sāvarṇi 61
Sāyaṇa 18, 20, 31, 101 104, 187
Seneśvarācārya 245
Serfoji 117
Śeṣakṛṣṇa 116, 161
Śeṣanāga 191
Śeśvaramīmāṁsā 245
Setubandha 78, 174
Sevyasevakopadeśa 101
Siddhāntabindu 242
Siddhāntacandrikā 190
Siddhāntadarpaṇa 199
Siddhāntadarpaṇavyākhyā 199
Siddhāntakaumudī 186, 236
Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha 242
Siddhāntamuktāvalī 230
Siddhāntasaṅgraha 250
Siddhāntaśiromaṇi 199
Siddharṣi 4, 126, 225
Siddhasenadivākara 96, 224
Siddhitraya 244
Siddhiyoga 207
Śikharaṇīmālā 249
Śikṣāsamuccaya 100, 222
Śikṣāṣṭaka 248
Śīlabhaṭṭārikā 108
Silhaṇa 101
Śilparatna 213
Simharāja 191
Simhāsanadvātrimśikā (Vikramārkacarita) 121
Śiṅgabhūpāla 180
Śiśupālavadha 80, 81, 89, 90
Śiṣyadhīvṛddhitantra 196
Sītārāghava 162
Sivabhujangastotra 96
Śivadāsa 121, 122

Page

Sivadatta 104
Śivādityamiśra 229
Śivadṛṣṭi 251
Śivādvaitanirṇaya 249
Śivalīlārṇava 89, 98, 162
Śivānandalaharī 96
Śivanārāyaṇabhañjamahodaya 163
Śivapurāṇa 61, 63, 65, 75
Śivārkamaṇidīpikā 249
Śivaśaktisādhana 86
Śivasūtra 250
,, 250, 252
Śivasūtravārtika 250
Śivasvāmin 82, 90
Śivatattvaratnakalikā 250
Śivotkarṣamañjarī 98
Skandapurāṇa 63, 65
Skandasvāmin 20
Ślokasaṅgraha 118, 120
Ślokavārtika 154, 234
Smṛticandrikā 203
Smṛtikalpataru 202
Smṛtimuktāphala 203
Smṛtiratnākara 203
Smṛtisaṅgraha 203
Snuṣāvijaya 162
Soḍḍhala 109, 115
Somadeva 109, 114, 139, 212
,, 110, 119, 120
,, 189
,, 159
,, 251
Somānanda 117
Somanātha 211
,, 235
,, 84, 101, 168
Somapālavilāsa 101
Somaprabha 103, 210, 213
Someśvara 234, 235, 236
,, 86, 116
Someśvaradeva 106, 148
Somila 251
Spandakārikā 251
Spandanirṇaya 251
Spandapradīpikā 251
Spandasarvasva 186, 187
Sphoṭavāda 188, 240, 241
Sphoṭasiddhi 187
Sphoṭāyana 196
Sphūrjidhvaja 96
Sragdharāstotra 244, 245
Śrībhāṣya 244
Śrībhāṣyavivaraṇa 162
Śrīdāmacarita 198
Śrīdhara

Page
Śrīdhara 224, 228
Śrīdharadāsa 104
Śrīgarbha 84
Śrīguṇaratnakośa 97
Śrīharṣa 85, 90, 194, 241
Śrījayagopāḷa 246
Śrīkaṇṭha 249
Śrīkaṇṭhabbhāṣya 249
Śrīkaṇṭhacarita 84, 90, 150
168, 180, 182 194
Śrīkara 235
Śrikarabhāṣya 250
Śrīkṛṣṇadeva (Śatāvadhānakavi) 94
Śrīkṛṣṇakavi 117
Śrīkumāra 213
Śrīnivāsa 248
Śrīnivāsacampu 116
Śrīnivāsācārya 252
Śrīnivāsadāsa 245
Śrīnivāsadīkṣita 89, 161
(Ratnakheṭa) 164
Śrīnivāsakavi 117
Śrīnivāsatīrtha 20, 239
Śrīpāda 181
Śrīpati 250
Śrīrāma 46
Śrīrāmamiśra 244
Śrīstava 97
Śrīvallabha 229
Śrīvara 88, 104
Śrīvatsa 228, 229
Śrīvatsāṅka 97, 244
Śrīvīrakavi 122
Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇabhāṇa 135, 161
Śṛṇgārakallola 96
Śṛṅgāramañjarī 162
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa 140, 179
Śṛṅgārasarvasva 162
Śṛṅgārasarvasvabhāṇa 161
Śṛṅgāraśataka 94, 100
Śṛṅgārasudhākara 162
Śṛṅgāratilaka (Ayyābhāṇa) 162
" 7, 94
Śṛṅgāratilaka 179
Śṛṅgāravairāgyataraṅgiṇī 101
Śrutabodha 192
Śrutapradīpikā 244

Page
Śrutaprakāśikā 244
Śrutidhara 93
Śrutiparīkṣā 222
Śrutisārasamuddharaṇa 241
Sthairyavicāraṇaprakaraṇa 86
Sthavirāvalīcarita 225
Sthirasiddhadūṣaṇa 223
Stotraratna 97
Stotrāvalī 97
Subandhu 56, 85, 112, 113, 119
" 110
" 140
" 177
Śubhacandra 225
Subhadrādhanañjaya 138, 139, 157
" 161
Subhādrāharṇa 163
Subhadrāpariṇaya 162
" 164
Śubhaṅkara 211
Subhāṣitahārāvali 104
Subhāṣitakaustubha 102
Subhāṣitanīvī 101
Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra 104
Subhāṣitaratnasandoha 101
Subhāṣitasudhānidhi 104
Subhāṣitāvali 104, 150
" 104
" 104
Subhaṭa 164
Subodhini 61
" 234
" 246
Subrahmaṇya 155
Sucaritamiśra 234
Sudarśanasūri 244
Sudhālaharī 98
Śūdraka 110, 131, 132, 133, 138, 140,
141, 148, 149, 150, 177
Śūdrakakathā 106, 143, 148
" 106, 148
Śuka 49
Śukapakṣīya 244
Śukasaptati 121, 125
Sukhānanda 208
Sukhāvatīvyūha 221
Sukhopajīvanī 235
Śukranītisāra 212
Sukṛtasankīrtana 86
Sūktānukramaṇi 34
Sūktimuktāvali 104, 108
Sūktiratnahāra 104,111
Sūktivāridhi 104
Sukumārakavi 88
Sumanottarā 106
Sumantu 49
Sundarapāṇḍya 100
Sundararājakavi 162
Sundarī 162

Page
Sūnyasaptati 222
Suprabhātastotra 96
Surapāla 208
Surathotsava 86
Sureśvara 208
,, 234, 241
Sūryaśataka 96
Sūryasiddhānta 199
Suśruta 206
Suśrutasamhitā 204, 206, 214
Sūtasamhitā 65

Sūtrālankāra 121, 221
Sūtrasamuccaya 100, 222
Sūvarṇaprabhāsa 221
Suvṛttatilaka 93, 157, 192
Svalpavivāhaphala 197
Svapnacintamani 197
Svapnadaśānana 158
Svapnanāṭaka 138
Svapnavāsavadatta 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 158
Svaramelakalānidhi 210
Svarūpasambodhana 224
Svātmārāmayogindra 232
Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 28
Syādvādakalikā 224
Syādvādamañjarī 224
Syādvādaratnākara 224
Śyāmadeva 178
Śyāmalādaṇḍaka 96
Śyāmaśāstrin 98
Śyāmilaka 153

T

Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa 25, 26
Taittirīyaprātiśākhyasūtra 30
Taittirīyāraṇyaka 26, 58
Taittirīyasamhitā 23, 25, 28
Taittirīyasamhitābhāṣyabhūmikā 18
Taittirīyopaniṣad 28, 29, 246
Tājika 197
Tālādhyāya 210
Talavakārabrāhmaṇa 25
Taṇḍalakṣaṇasūtra 33
Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa 33

Taṅka 238, 244
Tantradīpikā 239
Tantrākhyāyikā 125
Tantrāloka 251
Tantrarahasya 236
Tantrarāja 252
Tantraratna 234
Tantrasāra 235
,, 251
,, 252
Tantrasiddhānta 235
Tantraśikhāmaṇi 235
Tantravārtika 56, 100, 234
Tantravārtikavivaraṇa 234

Page
Tāpasavatsarāja 140, 157
Tapatīsamvaraṇa 138, 139, 157
Taralā 193
Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati 194
Taraṅgadatta 159
Taraṅgavatī 106, 112
Tarkabhāṣā 225, 230
Tarkakaumudī 230
Tarkāmṛta 230
Tarkanyāya 222
Tarkasańrgraha 230, 234
Tarkasaṅgrahadīpikā 230
Tarkaśāstra 222
Tārkikarakṣā 229
Tathāgataguhyaka 221
Tātparyacandrikā 239
,, 245
Tātparyadīpikā 65
,, 234
,, 244
Tātparyapariśuddhi 228
Tātparyaṭīkā 228, 234
Tattvas 203
Tattvabindu 235
Tattvabodhinī 186
Tattvacintāmaṇi 229, 230
Tattvacintāmaṇyāloka 229, 230
Tattvakaustubha 242
Tattvamuktākalāpa 245
Tattvanirṇaya 244
Tattvapradīpika 239, 242
Tattvaprakāśa 250
Tattvaprakāśikā 239, 248
Tattvaratnākara 244
Tattvārthādhigamasūtra 224
Tattvārthasāradīpikā 225
Tattvārthavārtikavyākhyānālaṅkāra 224
Tattvasamāsa 231
Tattvasaṅkhyāna 239
Tattvasaṅgraha 176, 219, 222, 252
Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā 222
Tattvasāra 244
Tattvasiddhāntavyākhyā 249
Tattvavaiśāradī 232
Tattvaṭīkā 244, 245
Tattvaviveka 242
Tattvavivekadīpana 242
Tattvoddyota 239
Tattvoktikośa 178
Tautātitamaṭatilaka 234
Tilaka 40, 46
Tilakamañjarī 112, 157, 194, 213
Tirumalāmbā 116
Tiruvāymoli 245
Tisaṭa 207
Tithinirṇaya 203
Toṭaka 241
Trikālaparīkṣā 222
Trikāṇḍaśeṣa 194

Page
Trilocana 229
Tripādanītinayana 234
Tripiṭaka 79, 206, 220
Tripuradāha 88
" 160
Tripuravadha 179
Tripuravijaya 135
Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita 84, 126
Triśatī 198
Trivikrama 190
Trivikramabhaṭṭa 109, 114, 119
Tryambakamakhin 46
Tulsidās 46
Tuptīkā 234
Tyāgarāja 98

U

Ubhayābhisārikā 138, 150
Udāttarāghava 157
Udaya 20
" 94
Udayākara 251
Udayana 227, 228, 229
Udayasundarīkathā 115
Udbhaṭa 174, 177, 178
Uddaṇḍa (Kavi) 94, 161
Uddhavasandeśa 94
Uddyotakara 112, 227, 228
Udgītācārya 20
Ugrabhūti 188
Ujjvalanīlamaṇi 181
Umāpatidhara 93
Umāsvati 224
Umveka 154, 234
Uṇādikośa 194
Uṇādisūtra 185, 187
" 188
" 189
Unmādavāsavadattā 154
Unmattarāghava 136, 161
" 161
Upadeśasāhasrī 102, 241
Upadeśaśataka 102
Upagranthasūtra 33
Upakramaparākrama 235
Upamitibhāvaprapañcakathā 4, 126, 225
Upaniṣadbhāṣya 241
Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa 25, 26
Uparāgakriyākarma 199
Upaskāra 230
Upavanavinoda 214
Upavarṣa 110, 182, 233, 236, 238, 244
Upāyahṛdaya 222
Urubhaṅga 139, 141
Urva 115
Uśanas 202
Uṣāniruddho 89
Utpala 251
Utpaladeva 97

Page
Utpaladeva 251
Utpalinī 193
Utprekṣāvallabha 88
Uttaracampu 116
Uttarapurāṇa 225
Uttararāmacarita 40, 130, 131, 132, 134, 150, 151, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158
Uvaṭa 20

V

Vācaspati 193
" 203
" 214
Vācaspatimiśra 227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 234, 235, 240, 241, 247, 249
Vācaspatya 194
Vādakuśala 222
Vādamārga 222
Vādanakṣatramālā 235
Vādāvalī 239
Vādavidhi 222
Vādidevasūri 229
Vādīndra 230
Vādirāja 239
Vādivāgīśvara 229
Vādivinoda 230
Vāgbhaṭa 84
" 180
" 180
" 206, 207, 208
" 214
Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra 180
" 180
Vāgvallabha 192
Vaidyajīvana 207
Vaidyanātha (Payaguṇḍa) 186, 202
Vaidyanāthadīkṣita 46
" 203
Vaijayantī 193, 247
Vaimānikaśāstra 214
Vairāgyapañcaka 101
Vairagyaśataka 100, 101
" 102
Vaiśampāyana 39, 48, 49, 50, 51
Vaiśeṣikasūrta 158, 214, 226, 228, 230
Vaitānaśrautasūtra 33
Vaitānasūtra 33
Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra 186
Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana 186
Vaiyāsikyanyāyamālā 242
Vājasaneyiprātiśākhyasūtra 30
Vājasaneyisamhitā 23, 25, 28, 34
Vajjālaggam 104
Vākpati (rāja) 81, 82, 91, 112, 115, 154, 167
Vakroktijīvita 178
Vakroktipañcāśikā 97
Vākya 238
Vākyapadīya 185, 187

Page
Vālīvadha 136
Vallabhācārya 246
Vallabhadeva 71, 93
" 104, 150
" 121
Vālmīki 6, 36, 37. 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 57, 67, 76, 92, 110, 112, 114, 159
" 190
Vālmīkibhāvaprakāśikā 46
Vālmīkihṛdaya 46
Vāmana 95, 140, 141, 148, 154, 171, 177, 212
" 185
Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa 88, 94, 113, 135, 161, 181, 194
Vāmanapurāṇa 63, 64
Vamśabrāhmaṇa 25
Vañgasena 207
Vāṇībhūṣaṇa 192
Varadābhyudaya (Hastigiricampu) 116, 117
Varadācārya 162
" 244
" 245
Varadāmbikāpariṇayacampu 116
Varadanārāyaṇabhaṭṭāraka 244
Varadarāja 186
" 203
" 228
Varadarājapañcāśat 98
Varadarājastava 98
Varadaviṣṇumiśra 244
Varāhamihira 70, 151, 191, 195 196, 197, 213,
Varāhapurāṇa 63, 65
Vararuci 2, 30, 68, 106, 110, 153, 182, 185, 187,
" 70
" 121
" 138 150
" 176, 190
Vararucikāvya 185
Vararucisaṅgraha 185
Vardhamāna 208
" 229
Varivasyāprakāśa 252
Vārṣagaṇya 231
Vārtika 2, 30, 68, 185, 189
Vārtikābharaṇa 234
Vasantatilakabhāna (Ammābhāṇa) 162
Vasantavilāsa 86
Vāsavadattā 112
" 106, 107, 112
Vāsavadattānāṭyādhāra 140
Vasiṣṭha 30. 74,, 201
Vaṣiṣṭhasamhitā 198
Vāstumaṇḍana 213
Vasubandhu 185, 222
Vāsudeva 88, 90
" 89
" 94
Vāsudevādhvarin 187
(Vāsudevadīkṣita) 236
Vāsudevaratha 116
Vāsudevasārvabhauma 229
Vasugupta 250, 251
Vasurāta 185
Vatsabhaṭṭi 69, 78
Vatsarāja 135, 136, 160
Vātsyāyana 77, 90, 150
(Mallanāga) 208, 209
" (Pakṣilasvāmin) 228
Vāyupurāna 51, 60, 63, 65, 66
Vāyuśāstra 197
Vedabhāṣyabhūmikāsaṅgraha 254
Vedakavi 164
Vedāṅgarāya 194
Vedāntadeśika 87, 93, 98, 101, 164 244, 245
Vedāntādhikaraṇamālā 246
Vedāntadīpa 244
Vedāntakalpataru 241, 242
Vedāntakārikāvalī 245
Vedāntaparibhāṣā 242
Vedāntapārijātasaurabha 248
Vedāntasāra 242
" 244
Vedāntavāgīśabhaṭṭācārya 161
Vedārthaprakāśa 20
Vedārthasaṅgraha 243, 244
Vemabhūpāla 181, 210
Vemabūpālacarita 113
Veṇisamhāra 130, 131, 134, 135, 153; 154, 155, 158
Venkaṭācārya 245
Venkaṭādhvarin 89, 98, 102, 114, 116, 162, 235
Venkaṭamādhava 20
Venkaṭamakhin 211, 234
Venkaṭeśa 192
Vetālapañcavimśatikā 121, 122, 125
Vibhramaviveka 240, 241
Vidagdha 235
Vidagdhamādhava 161
Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍanam 182
Viddhasālabhañjikā 158, 162
Vidhirasāyana 235
Vidhitrayaparitrāṇa 236
Vidhiviveka 234
Vidvajjanavallabha 197
Vidyābhūṣaṇa 181
Vidyādhara 181

Page
Vidyāmādhavīya 196
Vidyānātha 160, 181
Vidyāpariṇaya 164
Vidyāpati 122
Vidyāraṇya 161, 210, 213, 242
Vigraharājadeva Viśāladeva 159
Vigrahavyāvartanī 222
Vijjakā (Vijayā) 138, 152, 167, 174, 175
Vijayapraśasti 86
Vijayīndra 239
Vijñānabhikṣu 231, 232
242
Vijñānāmṛta 242
Vijñāneśvara 202
Vikhanas 202
Vikrama 93
Vikramāditya 193, 211
Vikramāṅkadevacarita 4, 83, 95, 167, 168, 170
Vikramodaya 121
Vikramorvaśīya 70, 71, 73, 131. 132 134, 136, 143, 144, 145, 158, 161, 173
Vikrāntaśūdraka 148
Vimalasarasvatī 186
Vimānacandrikā 214
Vimuktātman 241
Vīṇāvāsavadtta 148, 150
Vinayaprabhā 94
Viniyogasaṅgrana 33
Vīrabhadra 209
Vīrabhadravijṛmbhaṇa 160
Vīracarita 121
Vīracintāmaṇi 211
Vīramitrodaya 116, 203
Vīranandin 87
Vīrasena 77
Vīravijaya 163
Vīreśvara 102
Virūpākṣa 161
Virūpākṣayajvan 192
Viśākhadatta (Viśākhadeva) 113, 132, 133, 151, 152
Viśākhila 177
Viṣamabāṇalīlā 177
Viṣayavākyadīpikā 245
Viṣṇu 201
Viṣṇubhaṭṭa 229
Viṣṇucitta 244
Viṣṇudāsa 94
Viṣṇudharmottara 66, 213
Viṣṇupādādikeśāntavarṇana 96
Viṣṇupurāṇa 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 144
Viṣṇusahasranāma 55, 244, 248
Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya 241
Viṣṇuśarman 125
Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya 239
Viṣṇutrātā 94

Page
Viśrāntavidyāvinoda 207
Viśvaguṇādarśa 114, 116, 162, 169, 235
Viśvāmitra 211
Viśvanātha 135, 160
,, 162
,, 180
Viśvanāthanyāyapañcānana 230
Viśvaprakāśa 193
Viśvarūpa 163, 202, 229, 234
Viśveśvara 160, 180, 203
,, 162
,, 181
Viśveśvarasūri (Gāgābhaṭṭa) 236
Vītarāgastuti 224
Viṭṭhalanāthajī 246
Vivaraṇa 20
Vivaranaprameyasaṅgraha 242
Vivekacūḍāmaṇi 241
Vivekamañjarī 241
Vopadeva 64, 190, 207
Vosa 115
Vṛddhabharata 209
Vṛddhacāṇakya 100
Vṛddhagārgīsamhitā 194
Vṛddhajīvaka 207
Vṛddhajīvakiyā 207
Vṛddhavāsiṣṭhasamhitā 196
Vṛddhayavanajātaka 196
Vṛkṣāyurveda 208
,, 214
,, 214
Vṛnda 207
Vṛṣabhānujā 162
Vṛttaratnākara 192
Vṛttaratnāvalī 192
,, 192
Vṛtti 233
Vṛttivārtika 181
Vyāḍi 110, 184, 185, 193
Vyaktiviveka 153, 178, 180
Vyāpticarcā 222
Vyāsa 39, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 60, 61, 65, 83, 110, 112, 114, 115, 226, 231, 232, 236
Vyāsagīta 65
Vyāsaśikṣā 30
Vyāsaśrīrāmadeva 164
Vyāsayati 239, 242
Vyavahāramātṛkā 202
Vyavahāranirṇaya 203
Vyavahārasamuccaya 202
Vyomaśiva 228
Vyomavatī 228
Vyomayānārkaprakāśa 214
Vyomayānayantra 214

Page
Vyutpattivāda 230
Yādavābhyudaya 87
Yādavaprakāśa 193, 238, 246, 247
Yādavarāghavīya 89
Yajñanārāyaṇadīkṣita 88, 161, 181
Yajñaphala 142
Yajñata 235
Yājñavalkya 25, 30, 74
Yājñavalkyasmṛti 34, 184, 202
Yājñikopaniṣad 28
Yajurveda 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 24, 31, 127
——Kṛṣṇayajurveda 9, 10, 13, 20, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 105, 154
——Śuklayajurveda 9, 10, 20, 23, 25, 26 27, 29, 30, 33,
Yajurvedānukramaṇī 34
Yajurvedasamhitā 23, 26
Yamalāṣṭakatantra 210
Yamāri 222
Yāmuna 97, 244, 245
Yānabindu 214
Yantrakalpa 214
Yantrasarvasva 214
Yaśaścandra 168

Page
Yaśahpāla 163
Yaśastilakacampu 114, 212
Yāska 20, 31, 202
Yaśodhara 209
Yaśodharacarita 83, 167
Yaśovarman 154
Yaśovijayagaṇi 225
Yatidharmasamuccaya 247
Yatīndramatadīpikā 245
Yātrāprabandha 116
Yavanajātaka 196
Yavaneśvara 196
Yogabindu 224, 225
Yogācārabhūmisūtra 222
Yogamañjarī 208
Yogarahasya 244
Yogasāra 207
Yogasārasangraha 232
Yogaśāstra 101 207
Yogasūtra 206, 231, 232
Yogasūtrabhāṣya 231 232
Yogavāsiṣṭha 65
Yogayātrā 197
Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya 88
Yuktikalpataru 212
,, 250
Zend Avesta 11, 17

Dhc
891.209
V42h

A851

STANDARD SANSKRIT BOOKS

Text with Exhaustive Notes, Introduction, Commentary, Hindi Translation, etc.

	Rs. P
Banbhatta: Kadambari Katha Mukh	4·00
Bhartirihari: Niti Shatakam—Short Notes	0·75
Do. With Copious Notes	1·50
Bharves: Kiratarjuniyam, Cantos I & II, each Canto	1·25
Bhasa: Pratijnayaugandharayanam	1·50
Bhasa: Pratima Natakam	3·25
Bhasa: Swapnavasavaduttum	2·50
Bhattanarayan: Veni Samhara	5·50
Bhaubhuti: Uttaramcharit	4·50
Do. only third Act	1·25
Dandi: Vishrutcharitam. (Daskumarcharitam, Canto VIII)	1·50
Dandi: Daskumarcharitam (Poorvapeethika, Pratham Uchchwas)	1·00
Harsh: Ratnavali Natika	3·00
Harsh: Naishadhiyacharitam, Canto I	2·00
Ishopnishad	0·75
Kalidas: Abhigyan Shakuntalam	7·00
Do. do. Act IV only	1·00
Kshaimendra: Ramayan Manjari, containing slokas Nos. 162 to 413	1·50
Kalidas: Malvikagnamitram	3·00
Kalidas: Meghdutam, Purba Megh	2·25
Do. do. Uttar Megh	1·75
Kalidas: The Raghuvansa, Cantos I, IV, VI, XIII and XIV each	1·50
Do. do. Canto II	1·75
Kalidas: Kumar Sambhava, Canto V	1·75
Do. Canto I	1·00
Kalidas: Vikramorvashiyam	4·00
Magh: Shishupalvadham, Cantos I and II	2·00
Nalopakhayan: with English Translation only	1·50
Rik Sukta Sudha: Selection from Riggveda	5·00
Sighra Bodh	1·25
Suhirdabhed from Hitopadesh	1·25
Vallal: Bhoj Prabhanda	2·25
Vishakhdatta: Mudrarakshhasam	5·00
Panchatantra: Aprikchhit Karakam	1·50
Vyas: Shrimad Bhagwat Geeta, Chapter II	1·00

Ram Narain Lal Beni Prasad

PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS

ALLAHABAD-2